

JPRS-TAC-85-047

7 November 1985

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL



FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

7 November 1985

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

PRAVDA Editorial Article on Gorbachev Proposals (Moscow PRAVDA, 17 Oct 85)	1
Soviet Officials' Press Conference on Gorbachev Proposals (Various sources, various dates)	7
TASS Report	7
AFP Report	9
Moscow TV Coverage	10
Description of Video	16
PRAVDA Report	17
USSR: Further on U.S. Response to Gorbachev Proposals (Various sources, various dates)	23
'Improper Maneuvers', by Yuriy Kornilov	23
West European Response, by Aleksandr Zholkver	25
Clear, Honest Response Demanded, by Vitaliy Kobysh	26
U.S. Objections Rebutted, by Yuriy Solton	27
Not Meant To 'Outplay' U.S., by Viktor Levin	29
U.S. 'Unfair Approach', by V. Chernyshev	30
U.S. Professor in Support	33
PRAVDA Commentary 13 October	34
U.S. Deliberately 'Misinterprets' Offer	37
PRAVDA Commentary 14 October, by G. Vasiliyev	40
Carrington Remarks Criticized	44
Soviet Army Paper Editorial on Gorbachev Paris Visit (Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 12 Oct 85)	45
Soviet Politburo Discusses Gorbachev Paris Visit (Moscow Domestic Service, 10 Oct 85)	47
USSR: Reports, Comments on Third Round Proceedings (Various sources, various dates)	48
Strategic Arms Group 2 October	48
Medium-Range Arms Group 4 October	48

Space Arms Group 8 October	48
Strategic Arms Group 9 October	48
Kampelman Remarks Criticized	49
Karpov Sees 'No Concrete Results;	49
 Soviet General Mikhaylov on SDI, SS-20's, Chemical Arms (Konstantin Mikhaylov Interview; Vienna DIE PRESS, 21 Oct 85)	50
 CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS	
 USSR Paper on U.S. 'Disinformation' on CW (Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 6 Oct 85)	52
 PRAVDA Cites PRC Paper on U.S. Chemical Warfare Plans. (Moscow PRAVDA, 5 Oct 85)	53
 IZVESTIYA on Britain as Pentagon's 'Hostage' (Moscow TASS, 11 Oct 85)	54
 Soviet Scientist on Genetic Consequences of Chemical Warfare (Moscow TASS, 6 Oct 85)	55
 Briefs	
TASS: Luxembourg Urges Ban	56
 GENERAL	
 Belgium's Tindemans Discusses NATO Meeting (Leo Tindemans Interview; Hamburg ARD Television Network, 15 Oct 85)	57

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

PRAVDA EDITORIAL ARTICLE ON GORBACHEV PROPOSALS

PM161740 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Oct 85 First Edition p 4

[Editorial article: "The Time Has Come for Specific Action" -- uppercase passages published in boldface]

[Text] Never before has life raised with such persistence the question of the responsibility of governments, political parties, and their figures before history. M.S. Gorbachev's report to the CPSU Central Committee Plenum that has just been held, notes "international development has reached a line that cannot be crossed without making supremely responsible decisions aimed at putting an end to the arms race and stopping the slide toward war. These decisions cannot be postponed without the risk of losing control of dangerous processes that threaten the very existence of mankind. The curbing of the forces of militarism and war and the ensuring of lasting peace and reliable security are the fundamental problem of our time."

I.

The USSR has never begun and will never begin a war. The guarantee of that is the very social nature of the Soviet State and the tremendous creative plans that our country is elaborating and implementing. It must be clear to every sensible person that the primary precondition for the implementation of such plans is lasting peace. The Soviet State embodies its will for peace in constructive actions that do not admit contradictory interpretations. The Soviet Union places its economic and defensive might on the side of the struggle for peace.

The historical dispute between socialism and capitalism must not, it is our conviction, be resolved by force of arms. The creation of new means of destruction will not lead to the resolution of the tasks now facing the world community. The USSR and its allies call on the United States and its NATO partners to rise above the existing disagreements. The time has come to rethink accustomed concepts and to abandon "cold war" stereotypes, which have now become extremely dangerous.

In the nuclear missile age peace cannot be based only on military force, on the constant buildup of mountains of weapons. What is needed is a different, bold view of things that accords with the new realities in both the military and the political spheres.

The course of turning peoples and countries against one another is alien to the Soviet State. The idea that certain provocateurs persistently attempt to suggest to the Western public -- the idea that the USSR is seeking to drive a "wedge" between West Europe and the United States -- is groundless and absurd. In reality, we proceed from the premise that the problems of the modern world are so complex and interwoven, they can be resolved only by the common efforts of all states and peoples interested in the preservation of peace. No one nowadays can remain aloof from the struggle against the threat of nuclear war. Active political dialogue between governments, political parties, and social forces and movements that value the cause of international security is especially necessary now. The Soviet Union is open to cooperation with everyone who wants such mutual understanding and collaboration.

The CPSU and the Soviet State possess not only the political will for broad international cooperation, but also an awareness of the great responsibility incumbent on our country. It is not we who are to blame for the fact that mankind was plunged into the fateful circle of the arms race. The USSR has never initiated the production of instruments of death. The Land of the Soviets has existed for 68 years -- 68 years of tireless struggle to rid the peoples of the heavy burden of military spending and of the threat of war.

True to Leninist traditions of foreign policy, since World War II the Soviet Union has submitted over 100 specific proposals aimed at strengthening peace and preventing, limiting, and reducing the arms race, especially the nuclear missile arms race. Most of these initiatives, which are long-term in character, retain their validity, including the proposal on the fundamental question: general and complete disarmament. Now that stormclouds of war are gathering over the planet, the USSR is multiplying its efforts to prevent this danger.

II.

The Soviet Union is prepared for radical reductions in nuclear weapons provided that there is a total ban on space strike arms. This formulation of the question agrees with the January accord between the USSR and U.S. foreign ministers.

The new Soviet initiative was not born in a vacuum. Despite all of Washington's attempts to disrupt and tear the fabric of detente, a great deal of what has been achieved continues to be preserved. Military-strategic parity between the USSR and the United States is preserved. The unlimited-duration treaty between the USSR and the United States on the limitation of ABM systems continues to operate. The SALT II treaty is being observed in practice. The treaty on the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons and the treaty on the prohibition of nuclear tests in the three environments are in operation. These limitations are exerting their positive influence. However, it is clear that if the United States implements its plans for taking weapons into space, not only will these limitations lose their effectiveness [utratyat svoyu deystvennost], but a new round of the arms race -- involving space strike arms -- will be begun.

While striving to involve all countries in the process of creating a system of lasting international security, our country is at the same time unilaterally adopting measures aimed at preserving peace and ending the arms race.

In 1982, the USSR adopted a unilateral commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and urged the United States to follow this example. Nobody must have any doubt: Our country will not be the first to take weapons into space. The USSR unilaterally suspended further siting of its medium-range missiles and implementation of other counter-measures in Europe and urged the United States of reciprocate. As of 6 August 1985, the USSR decided to unilaterally halt any nuclear explosions and urged the United States to reciprocate. This appeal is also addressed to the other nuclear powers, of course.

Naturally such unilateral steps cannot be taken as being of unlimited duration if the other side evades the adoption of the proposals we have submitted and continues the arms race. But, they could be of unlimited duration if the United States was to follow the Soviet example.

The peoples have a right to demand of other countries, primarily the United States, the adoption of radical measures to reduce and ultimately eliminate nuclear weapons. The new Soviet proposals spelled out by M.S. Gorbachev during his visit to France are in keeping with precisely this objective.

FIRST, THE SOVIET UNION PUT TO THE U.S. GOVERNMENT A PROPOSAL THAT AGREEMENT BE REACHED ON TOTALLY BANNING SPACE STRIKE ARMS FOR BOTH SIDES AND RADICALLY REDUCING, BY 50 PERCENT, THEIR NUCLEAR WEAPONS WHICH CAN REACH EACH OTHER'S TERRITORY. The USSR proposes that the total number of USSR and U.S. nuclear means which can reach each other's territory would be equal to 1,250 and 1,680 respectively; that is, it agrees to the United States having a slight preponderance in terms of delivery vehicles.

The USSR is prepared to agree to this while bearing in mind that, following a 50 percent reduction in nuclear weapons delivery vehicles, both sides would have an equal number of nuclear charges -- 6,000 each -- and approximate strategic equilibrium would thereby be ensured. The Soviet delegation in Geneva has submitted specific proposals on this question.

This proposal is aimed at practically resolving the objectives of the Geneva talks agreed on by the USSR and the United States: not only to end the nuclear arms race, but to sharply reduce the level of such arms and simultaneously avert an arms race in space. The implementation of this measure is in keeping with the vital interests of all states since it would radically strengthen strategic stability and mutual trust.

It is perfectly obvious that a halving of the USSR and U.S. nuclear missile means capable of reaching each other's territory is possible only given agreement on the total prohibition of space strike arms. This is an honest and just approach. The USSR is prepared to conduct negotiations, but not on space weapons, not on precisely which kinds of these weapons will be sited in space, but on its nonmilitarization. In Geneva, the Soviet Union has proposed that agreement be reached on banning the development [sozdaniye], including scientific research work; testing; and deployment [razvertyvaniye] of space strike arms. Of course it is not the fundamental sciences that are meant here; that kind of research is being conducted and obviously will be conducted. The greatest danger is posed precisely by the development projects [razrabotki] which are being carried out in the United States in line with military department assignments and contracts; moreover, at a stage when mockups, experimental samples, and prototypes are bound to appear and field proving and testing [otrabotki i ispytaniya] outside the laboratory is bound to be carried out.

THE SECOND SOVIET PROPOSAL CONCERNS MEDIUM-RANGE NUCLEAR MEANS IN EUROPE. IN ORDER TO FACILITATE AN ACCORD ON THEIR SWIFTEST MUTUAL REDUCTION, THE USSR DEEMS IT POSSIBLE TO CONCLUDE AN APPROPRIATE ACCORD SEPARATELY, WITHOUT A DIRECT LINK WITH THE PROBLEM OF SPACE AND STRATEGIC ARMS. This approach may prove to be practical.

The USSR's stance on the question of the position of French and British nuclear potential in the European balance of forces was clarified. This potential is growing fast and it has to be taken into account. It was pointed out on the French side that France's nuclear forces are not subject to discussion without its participation. The Soviet Union is prepared for direct discussions with France just like, of course, with Britain. Here the Soviet Union will most attentively take into account the interests of French and British security.

THIRD. ADDRESSING THE FRESH PARLIAMENTARIANS, M.S. GORBACHEV RECALLED THAT THE SOVIET UNION HAS DECLARED A MORATORIUM ON THE DEPLOYMENT OF MEDIUM-RANGE MISSILES IN EUROPE. HE ANNOUNCED THAT THE NUMBER OF SS-20 MISSILES WHICH THE SOVIET UNION HAS ON COMBAT STANDBY IN THE EUROPEAN ZONE NOW STANDS AT 243 UNITS. THIS MEANS IT IS EXACTLY EQUAL TO THE LEVEL IN JUNE 1984, WHEN THE ADDITIONAL DEPLOYMENT OF SOVIET MISSILES BEGAN IN RESPONSE TO THE INSTALLATION OF U.S. MEDIUM-RANGE MISSILES IN EUROPE. THE SS-20 MISSILES THAT WERE DEPLOYED IN ADDITION HAVE AT PRESENT BEEN TAKEN OFF COMBAT STANDBY, WHILE STATIONARY INSTALLATIONS FOR THE DEPLOYMENT OF THESE MISSILES WILL BE DISMANTLED WITHIN THE NEXT 2 MONTHS. THIS IS VERIFIABLE. BUT THE USSR'S COUNTERMEASURES WITH REGARD TO THE TERRITORY OF THE UNITED STATES ITSELF REMAIN IN FORCE.

The Soviet side clarified the meaning attached to the term "European zone" in this instance: This is the zone in which missiles capable of striking targets on West European territory are deployed and it extends beyond the Urals to the 80th meridian.

The Soviet Union has withdrawn the SS-5 missiles from service and is continuing the withdrawal of SS-4 missiles from service. This means that overall, the number of missile delivery vehicles in the USSR's European zone is now significantly lower than it was 10 and even 15 years ago. In limiting itself in this way, the Soviet Union is guided by the broad interests of European security. Europe is now entitled to expect a U.S. step in response: the cessation of further deployment of its medium-range missiles on the European Continent.

An agreement banning the creation [sozdaniye], testing, and deployment of space strike weapons in near-earth space would open the way for broad international cooperation in the peaceful exploration of space and a Soviet proposal on this has already been submitted to the United Nations. Instead of "star wars" plans, a program for "star peace" benefiting all mankind would be implemented.

The implementation of the program put forward by the Soviet Union would enable mankind to advance toward the implementation of its cherished goal: the banning and total elimination of nuclear weapons and deliverance from the threat of a nuclear missile war.

III.

Only forces interested in maintaining international tension can portray the peace initiatives proposed by the Soviet Union as "propaganda." These initiatives have aroused a tremendous international response. The broadest circles of the world public are describing them as some of the most radical and significant Soviet initiatives. Many people recognize that any discussion in the world on the problem of disarmament is now focused primarily on the new Soviet initiatives.

This is obviously not to the liking of some people in the United States; not only there. Indeed! After all, yet another breach has appeared in the "iron curtain" of deception with which imperialist circles have been and still are diligently surrounding the USSR's policy. The truth about the peace-loving intentions of the CPSU and the Soviet State is becoming known to millions of people in Western countries who are importunately assured of the existence of a "Soviet military threat." The opponents of international cooperation feel that the foundations of their arms race policy are beginning to crack. Some people in the United States are even overcome with fear at the thought that the accord which the world's peoples are so eagerly awaiting could be reached at the forthcoming Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva.

The Soviet Union is striving for just such a turnaround.

Nonetheless, certain circles in the United States and other NATO countries that have linked themselves to the arms race policy are not slackening their attempts to sow distrust in the new Soviet peace initiatives. But truth is on the side of sober-minded forces.

Undoubtedly, stopping the nuclear arms race; subsequently, considerably reducing nuclear arms; and preventing the militarization of space would seriously reduce tension worldwide; first and foremost, on the European Continent.

In particular, in Europe the Soviet Union is proposing an entire series of measures aimed at furthering the process of reducing the level of military confrontation. There is a possibility of starting to reduce the conventional armed forces and arms of NATO and the Warsaw Pact in central Europe commencing with a reduction of Soviet and U.S. Armed Forces. Our country is prepared to do everything incumbent on it to create [sozdaniye] a chemical weapons-free zone in the center of Europe. The Soviet Union proposes the elaboration of an international agreement, similar to the nonproliferation treaty, on the nonproliferation of chemical weapons with a view to entirely banning them and eliminating stockpiles of them in the future.

The Soviet Union supports the idea of creating nuclear-free zones in northern Europe and the Balkans and the proposal to create a corridor free from nuclear weapons on both sides of the line separating the two military-political groupings. The USSR believes that countries which do not possess nuclear weapons or have them on their territory have a right to reliable guarantees in international law of their security and [guarantees] that nuclear weapons will not be used against them.

At the Stockholm conference, where the outlines of an accord on concretizing the principle of the nonuse of force and making it as effective as possible are being drawn up, the Soviet Union supports the adoption of certain confidence-building measures in the military sphere, including the proposal that there be reciprocal exchanges of the annual plans for certain types of military activity.

The USSR, together with its allies, advocates overcoming the division of Europe into opposing groupings in the more or less foreseeable future. But even under conditions of the existence of the two blocs, it is possible to create a "modus vivendi" which would blunt the acuteness of recent confrontation. For instance, there is no lifetime taboo on the possibility of establishing contacts between the Warsaw Pact and NATO as organizations.

The creation of an atmosphere of security and confidence on the European Continent would make it possible to develop East-West economic ties more widely and intensively and to pool the European countries' efforts in maintaining and improving the environment and expanding the flow of information on each other's life, cultural exchanges, and human contacts. The establishment of more businesslike relations between CEMA and the EEC would also be useful. And to the extent that the EEC countries act as a "political unit," common ground with them can also be sought on specific international problems.

The significance of the measures proposed by the Soviet Union goes far beyond the bounds of the European Continent. The USSR's radical proposals are actively supported by supporters of peace in all countries. Peoples everywhere are demanding from their governments real steps leading to an easing of tension and the surmounting of the present stage of confrontation on the entire planet.

CSO: 5200/1057

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SOVIET OFFICIALS' PRESS CONFERENCE ON GORBACHEV PROPOSALS

TASS Report

LD221458 Moscow TASS in English 1245 GMT 22 Oct 85

[Text] Moscow, October 22 TASS -- A press conference was held here today in connection with the USSR's new proposals on questions of nuclear and space armaments. The following officials took part in the press conference: First Deputy Foreign Minister of the USSR Georgiy Korniyenko, Chief of General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, First Deputy Defence Minister Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Akhromeyev, head of the International Information Department of the CPSU Central Committee Leonid Zamyatin.

Opening the press conference, Leonid Zamyatin said:

"The Soviet Union, guided by the desire to create conditions for the adoption of practical measures which would make it possible to curb the arms race and defuse the explosive situation in the world, has advanced concrete proposals at the Soviet-American talks in Geneva on the entire range of problems related to space and nuclear -- both strategic and medium-range -- armaments."

Leonid Zamyatin recalled that the essence of these proposals was set forth by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev in his statements in Paris. "Proposals for preventing the development and deployment of strike space weapons and radically cutting the nuclear armaments of the USSR and the United States which reach their respective territories constitute the core of the new Soviet initiatives", he said.

"Combined with our previous actions, these proposals make up a complete of concrete constructive measures the implementation of which would bring about a genuine turn in the development of international relations, termination of the arms race on earth and its prevention in outer space."

(The) new Soviet proposals, the speaker went on to say, found approval of political and public circles practically in all countries. "The interest in the Soviet proposals is particularly high on the eve of the Soviet-American summit meeting which gives an opportunity for adopting major decisions on the questions of curbing the arms race and effecting a turn for the better in the existing international situation." [passage indistinct]

Objective underlying [as received] the development of ABM system is to provide the United States with a capability of making a first nuclear strike at the Soviet Union with impunity and deprive it of a possibility to retaliate, the marshal said.

"Under these conditions, conceding any restrictions and, the more so, deep cuts in strategic offensive armaments without an accord banning strike space weapons means neglecting the Soviet Union's security. We shall never agree to that," he emphasized.

Georgiy Korniyenko was asked what was the explanation for the fact that American Administration officials stubbornly describe the new Soviet proposals as "counter-proposals."

Washington, the Soviet representative replied, "would very much like to evade responsibility for the failure of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space armaments to make any advance so far. So the attempt is being made to create the impression that the United States earlier advanced some proposals, while the USSR is doing this only now. In actual fact, the American side, ever since the beginning of the Geneva talks, has not made a single new proposal."

In reply to the question if the Soviet Union is being engaged in research similar to the American SDI programme, Marshal Akhromeyev said: "the Soviet Union is conducting basic research in the field of outer space. Work is also being carried out on developing and perfecting space-based systems of missile attack early warning, reconnaissance, communications, navigation and meteorology. But we are not engaged in the work on creating strike space weapons, we are not developing an ABM system of the country. In brief, we do not have "star wars" programmes analogous to the American ones. The USSR strictly complies with the treaty limiting ABM systems."

The journalists were interested in what might be the further development of events in the situation when the United States is continuing nuclear tests after the Soviet Union introduced a moratorium on its nuclear explosions.

Georgiy Korniyenko recalled that the Soviet Union introduced the unilateral moratorium, starting from August 6 this year till January 1, 1986, but will remain valid further on as long as the United States followed the example of the Soviet Union. "Unwilling to end nuclear weapon tests, U.S. officials usually refer to the verification problem. But this is just an excuse," he pointed out.

The Soviet representatives have refuted the United States claims that the Soviet Union now has a military advantage. They cited the concrete figures on each type of weapons proving the existence of rough military parity between the sides.

There was a question among others: Is the U.S. administration's assertion that the SDI programme is "highly ethical" since it is designated not against people but against missiles, true?

"The thesis 'missiles against missiles, not against people' is a deception built on people's fear of nuclear weapons," Leonid Zamyatin stressed. "Propaganda aside, the essence of the American SDI boils down to the perfidious aim: To assure the United States a capability to make a nuclear strike at the USSR with impunity and deprive it of a chance to retaliate. What is ethical here?"

"As the emergence of nuclear weapons did not result in the elimination of conventional ones, so the strike space armaments will not rid mankind of nuclear weapons," Leonid Zamyatin went on to say. "And the authors of the SDI are well aware of that. The development and deployment of strike weapons in outer space and an anti-missile defence of the country on their bases will inevitably result in an increase and qualitative perfection of the strategic offensive armaments. That is why the SDI programme will cause an unchecked arms race in all directions."

AFP Report

WA221602 Paris AFP in English 1457 GMT 22 Oct 85

[Text] Moscow, Oct 22 (AFP) -- The Soviet Union is pursuing no space defence programme comparable to the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), Soviet Army Chief of Staff Marshal Sergei Akromeyev said here today.

"The USSR has observation satellites in space... but has not deployed a strike force" there, Marshal Akromeyev told journalists at a press conference on Soviet disarmament proposals for next month's U.S.-Soviet summit in Geneva.

"We are not working on any programme comparable to SDI," he said.

The Soviet Army chief also referred to an article he had written in Sunday's edition of the Communist Party newspaper PRAVDA, in which he hinted that the Soviet Union might match SDI -- the so-called "star wars" project -- with its own programme.

The PRAVDA article said that if Washington went ahead with its plans for space-based military systems, the Soviet Union "could not afford not to take counter-measures in the fields of offensive weapons as well as in others."

In "other" systems, Marshal Akromeyev included "defensive weapons including those based in outer space," the article said.

SDI involves research on ways of shooting down incoming missiles in space before they reach their targets.

Leonid Zamyatin, who directs the powerful International Information Department of the Communist Party Central Committee, said: "The United States will never have a monopoly on space weapons."

Questioned at the press conference on the current situation of Marshal Akromeyev's predecessor, Marshal Nikolai Ogarkov, Mr Zamyatin said the former army chief "has not disappeared."

"He continues to work fruitfully," he said.

Marshal Ogarkov, who was sacked from the post in September 1984 for reasons that are still unclear and who has been little heard of since, now "occupies a high post in the defence ministry," Mr Zamyatin said.

Moscow TV Coverage

LD221855 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1605 GMT 22 Oct 85

[Text] Today in the Press Center of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs there was a press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists. It was held in connection with the new Soviet proposals on questions of nuclear and space weapons. Taking part in the press conference were: Comrade Korniyenko, first deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR; Marshal of the Soviet Union Akhromeyev, chief of the General Staff of the Armed Forces, first deputy minister of defense of the USSR, and Comrade Zamyatin, chief of the International Information Department of the CPSU Central Committee.

Comrade Zamyatin made a statement at the press conference:

[Begin recording] [Zamyatin] The Soviet Union, guided by the desire to create conditions for the implementation of practical measures which would permit the arms race to be restrained and the tension in the explosive situation in the world to be eliminated, has put forward at the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva specific proposals on the whole complex of problems relating to space and nuclear weapons, both strategic and medium-range.

The essence of these proposals was outlined by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in his speeches in Paris. The most important aspect of the new Soviet initiatives are the proposals to avert the creation and siting of space strike weapons, and to radically reduce the Soviet and U.S. nuclear weapons which can reach each other's territories. Together with our previous actions, these proposals represent a complex of specific, constructive measures which when implemented would lead to a genuine breakthrough in the development of international relations, to the cessation of the arms race on earth, and to avoidance of the arms race in space.

The new Soviet proposals have received approval from political and public circles of practically all the countries of the world. They see in these proposals the way to an improvement of the world situation, to a lessening of the threat of nuclear war which is hanging over humanity. Interest in the Soviet proposals is particularly strong on the eve of the Soviet-U.S. summit, which presents the opportunity for responsible decisions on questions of limiting of the arms race and changing the existing international situation for the better. Having come forward with such radical proposals on space and nuclear weapons, the Soviet Union is seeking one thing only: just and honest agreements. Without one side seeking any form of military advantages.

Our initiatives fully correspond to the well-known January understanding between the Soviet Union and the United States. It is necessary to state, however, that certain circles, above all in the United States, are trying to instill doubts about the motive behind the Soviet proposals. At today's press conference, we are prepared to answer questions which you may have in connection with the new Soviet proposals. Let us have your questions, please. Valentin Sergeyevich Zorin, Central Television.

[Zorin] In the West the problem has been put in recent days as follows: If the Soviet Union and the United States have the possibility of reaching an agreement on substantial reductions in nuclear weapons, why should that possibility be made conditional on a ban on space weapons? Would it not be better to solve these problems in sequence? They often ask this in the West, and I would appreciate a reply to this question.

[Akhromeyev] The treaty on limiting antimissile systems has always been the basis for the negotiations on limiting and reducing strategic weapons. Let us recall that the treaty was, after all, signed at the same time a provisional agreement on SALT I was signed and that the SALT II Treaty, which was signed in 1979, was worked out taking into account the existence of the ABM Treaty. Moreover, the ABM Treaty itself says that measures to limit antimissile defense systems are a substantial factor in restraining the strategic offensive arms race. This was stated at the time of the signing, in 1972. At that time, only earth-based antimissile defense was under consideration; the issue of space-based antimissile defense did not arise.

Now the situation has changed, and changed radically, I would say. The United States has announced the intention to create [sozdat] a global antimissile defense system with space-based elements. Whatever they say about this in the United States and the U.S. Administration, we believe the aim of their attempt to create [sozdat] this global antimissile defense is to ensure for the United States the ability of making a first nuclear strike at the Soviet Union with impunity, and, having created [sozdat] the country's antimissile defense depriving it of the possibility of a retaliatory strike. Under these conditions, embarking on any sort of limitations--especially, drastic reductions in strategic offensive weapons--without an agreement on banning space strike weapons would mean neglecting the security of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union will never do on that. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, in an interview with TIME magazine, said that if there is no agreement on the nonmilitarization of space, it will also prove impossible to reach an agreement on the limitation and reduction of nuclear weapons. We should like it to be understood in the West that this is our firm position.

[Zamyatin] A question for Comrade Korniyenko. MAINICHI, Masashi (Egover). Is not the linkage of the Soviet proposal on sharp reductions in strategic weapons with the demand for a ban on work on SDI an insurmountable obstacle at the Geneva talks?

[Korniyenko] In defining the subject and aims of the Geneva talks in January this year the parties agreed -- and this was enshrined in the published joint statement -- that the subject of the talks would be the complex of questions concerning space and nuclear weapons, and that moreover, those questions would be examined and decided in their interrelationship. That is the first thing. Secondly, the way we pose the question in relation to SDI is also based on what the parties agreed in January, namely, the aim of the talks should be the elaboration of effective accords aimed at preventing the arms race in space and stopping it on earth. Therefore, we should see the insurmountable obstacle, as you put it, at the Geneva talks as being the refusal of the United States to keep to this accord, not the contrary.

[Zamyatin] BRD radio, Federal Republic of Germany, Wolfgang (Nette). Do there exist more destabilizing and less destabilizing weapons systems? Which systems would you put in the more destabilizing category?

[Akhromeyev] I have recently had occasion to answer such a question. I can repeat once again that the concept of more or less destabilizing armaments is a discovery that has been made by the present U.S. Administration. The former administrations of Presidents Nixon, Ford, and Carter did not raise this question at the talks with us.

Now, the White House puts into the more destabilizing systems category those means which are most developed by us, the USSR, and form the basis of its military might -- in particular the Soviet intercontinental ballistic missiles -- which, according to U.S. reckoning, are to be eliminated. However, those means which form the U.S. strength -- submarine-based ballistic missiles and heavy bombers with 20 to 28 long-range cruise missiles on board each -- they put into the category of means of stability and security.

We do not agree with this. Now, all strategic means are drawing closer together in their strike capabilities. There is no difference in the military effectiveness, range, precision, or capacity of warheads between our intercontinental ballistic missiles and the U.S. submarine-based Trident ballistic missiles. The United States prefers to keep quiet about the military effectiveness of the sea-based Trident I and Trident II missiles because their capabilities are equivalent to our intercontinental ballistic missiles.

It is precisely for this reason that the whole triad of strategic armaments -- intercontinental ballistic missiles, submarine-based ballistic missiles, and heavy bombers -- should be regarded as a complex, as a single whole. This is the very foundation of the talks. It is precisely this foundation which allows the elaboration of an equal agreement which does not damage either side -- of course, with the condition of the total banning of space strike weapons.

[Zamyatin] There is a question from (Atanas Atanasov) of the Bulgarian RABOTNICHESKO DELO. Representatives of the U.S. Administration state that the Soviet proposal for a 50 percent reduction in nuclear armaments requires a radical restructuring of the U.S. triad. Do you consider this to be correct?

[Akhromeyev] Our proposal is for a 50 percent reduction in the nuclear armaments on both sides which are capable of reaching the other side's territory and which are graphically depicted on this chart. It does not require a radical restructuring of the strategic nuclear forces we have; nor, in our opinion, of those the United States has, either. The point is, as I have already noted in my reply to a previous question, that intercontinental ballistic missiles form the basis of our strategic nuclear forces. They carry the largest number of warheads. The United States has approximately the same number of warheads on sea-based ballistic missiles.

We think, and we have put forward this proposal, that in the total of 6,000 warheads, which it is proposed to leave after the reduction in armaments, there should be one type out of the triad which would be the main one, the leading one and would account for 60 percent of the warheads. We think, and this proposal has been put forward that this will not upset either our strategic nuclear forces or those of the United States. We think this proposal is mutually advantageous and just.

[Zamyatin] Sergey Fedorovich, I have a question for Georgiy Markovich Korniyenko. It is asked by Captain Second Rank, Mikitin, international observer for KRASNAYA ZVEZDA: It is well known that the United States is continuing its nuclear tests after the USSR has introduced a moratorium on its nuclear explosions. How can events develop further?

[Kornienko] I remind you that when the Soviet Union introduced its moratorium, on 6 August, on all nuclear explosions, it was clearly stated that this moratorium would remain in force until 1 January 1986. However, it would remain in force even longer if the United States followed our example. Thus, Washington was given 5 months for reflection, a perfectly adequate period, I think.

Not wishing to halt their nuclear weapons tests, U.S. representatives usually refer to the problem of verification.

The real reason for this unwillingness was given in an official--I stress, official--letter from the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to the U.S. Congress, also a perfectly official U.S. legislative body. Claiming that a halt to nuclear arms tests would not correspond to the best interests of the United States, as it puts it, the authors of the letter openly explained this by saying that, and I quote, nuclear tests are absolutely essential for the development [razrabortka], modernization, and testing [proverka godnosti] of warheads. That's your explanation for you. There would seem to be no need to put it any clearer than that.

As for the possibility of verification of a halt to nuclear tests -- in which, incidentally, the Soviet Union has just as great an interest as the United States -- I think it will be enough to mention the following fact: Soon after our declaration of a moratorium on nuclear explosions, an explosion was carried out at the U.S. Nevada test site, about which not a single report has been published in the United States to this day. Evidently they hoped that, in view of the low power of this explosion, it would go unnoticed and they would then be able to say: You see, without on-site inspection it's no good. In fact, that explosion was registered in the Soviet Union; the U.S. Government knows this, but prefers to keep silent about it.

[Zamyatin] A question for Marshal Akhromeyev from the correspondent of the BERLINER ZEITUNG, Manfred Quiring. The United States asserts that at the current time the strategic military parity has been upset and that today the Soviet Union enjoys a military advantage. What can you say about the military balance?

[Akhromeyev] Of course they have a lot to say in the United States and in the West about the so-called Soviet military superiority, but they always speak about it with a special zeal in the months before the next U.S. budget is to be approved. If we are to speak about the facts, however, the truth is that, for a fair number of years now, there has been an approximate military equality of the sides. There is a balance of strategic nuclear forces between the United States and the Soviet Union; this was adjusted down to the tiniest details, I would say, when the SALT II treaty was being worked out. The preparations for this treaty lasted 7 years; for 7 years both sides sized up, before signing the treaty, what forces the opposite side had. In June 1979, when signing the SALT II treaty, Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev and President Carter officially recorded this balance of strategic nuclear forces. It has not changed up to the present, since the number of carriers [nositeli] which was determined by SALT II on each side has not changed. Now--this is also shown on the table--the Soviet Union has 2,504 strategic carriers; the United States there are 2,210. On the other hand, the United States has a larger number of warheads on the carriers than we do. On the whole, however, an approximate balance exists.

What about medium-range nuclear weapons? Look at the second table. At present, the United States has already deployed [razvernuli] in Western Europe 209 missiles: 81 Pershing missiles and 128 cruise missiles. In all, the NATO countries have 387 medium-range missiles in Europe, on which are deployed 739 warheads. The Soviet Union has 373 missiles in the European zone, including 243 SS-20 missiles. If one counts air forces in Europe, the NATO bloc has more medium-range carriers and more warheads on them than the Warsaw Pact. Taking into account the different compositions of the sides' nuclear arms, it is possible to speak of approximate equality, approximate balance in medium-range means too.

[Zamyatin] Sergey Fedorovich, I would like to add that a report by the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the U.S. Armed Forces at the end of 1984 said directly -- I quote -- that at the given period approximate nuclear parity exists between the United States and the Soviet Union. Probably this is clearer to the Joint Chiefs of Staff than it is to others in the United States.

[Zamyatin] A question to you, Sergey Fedorovich, from the correspondent of the Belgian paper LIBRE BELGIQUE, Waldemar Vishnevsky. Can you confirm that the Soviet Union is carrying out research work [issledovatelskiye raboty] similar to the American work on SDI? To what end is this work being carried out?

[Akhromeyev] Work similar to the U.S. SDI work is not being conducted in the Soviet Union. Basic research work in the area of space is being conducted in the Soviet Union. Work is also being conducted in our country on the creation [sozdaniye] and perfection of space-based systems for early warning of a missile attack, space-based communications, navigation, meteorological, and intelligence systems -- that is space-based systems which, in military language, are described as operational and combat support [obespecheniye] systems. These are not offensive systems. The Soviet Union does not have offensive weapons in space. We are not conducting work on the creation of offensive space-based weapons, nor are we developing systems for the country's anti-missile defense. We have no "star wars" programs similar to the U.S. ones. The Soviet Union is faithfully fulfilling the Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Systems.

[Zamyatin] A question by Andrzej Bajorek of the newspaper ZYCIE WARSZAWY. I am interested in the moral aspect of the SDI question. Washington asserts that this program is highly moral because it can rid humanity of nuclear weapons, and the SDI military systems -- lasers and so on -- are directed against missiles, not against people. What do you think about this in fact?

I shall reply to Comrade Bajorek that the theory of missiles against missiles and not against people is overall deceit which is built upon people's fears in the face of nuclear weapons. If you cast aside the propaganda and reveal the essence of the U.S. so-called SDI, then it pursues, I should say, a perfidious goal: To acquire for the United States the capability of inflicting a nuclear strike with impunity against the Soviet Union, having deprived it of the possibility of a counterstrike. What is moral in this? There is nothing moral in it. Just as the arrival of nuclear weapons did not lead to the elimination of conventional weapons, so offensive space armaments will not, of course, deliver humanity from nuclear weapons.

A question to Marshal Akhromeyev from the Japanese paper SANKEI SHIMBUN. In a 19 October PRAVDA article you wrote: If it continues in this way, no other course will remain for us other than to undertake countermeasures in the areas both of offensive and of other armaments, not excluding defensive armaments including space-based ones. End of quote. What do you mean by the words "defensive armaments including space-based ones", the correspondent asks.

[Akhromeyev] Indeed. What is there for the Soviet Union to do if SDI is implemented, if -- as they assert -- an impenetrable shield appears over the territory of the United States and, at the same time, all those offensive strategic forces which are now in existence and are being deployed [razvertyvayutsya] remain? What then remains for the Soviet Union to do if all this is implemented regardless of everything? What remains for it to do is what was written on 19 October: If it continues in this way, no other course will remain for us other than to undertake countermeasures both in the area of offensive armaments and of other armaments, not excluding defensive armaments including space-based ones. No other course will remain open for the Soviet Union. Then an uncontrollable arms race will begin such as the world has not seen so far. It is apparently this for which the United States is striving, for some reason or other.

[Zamyatin] Kolesnichenko of PRAVDA. Go ahead, please.

[Kolesnichenko] How is one to explain the fact that official U.S. Administration spokesmen persistently describe the new Soviet proposals which were set forth by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in Paris as counterproposals? How is this to be understood? Georgiy Markovich Korniyenko, over to you.

[Korniyenko] The explanation is simple. Washington would very much like to avoid responsibility for the fact that it was its fault there has so far been no movement at the talks on nuclear and space weapons in Geneva. Washington is endeavoring to create the impression that the United States submitted certain proposals earlier and the USSR is doing it only now, by describing them as counterproposals. In fact, the U.S. side has not submitted a single, new proposal since the beginning of the talks in Geneva. In the part concerning strategic and medium-range nuclear weapons, it has only repeated the positions it set forth at previous talks, which were wrecked by the United States. And in the part concerning space, the United States showed only a readiness to recount in general what sort of universal paradise will come about when the United States has created its space shield. If these are regarded as proposals, then I wonder what is considered obstruction?

Meanwhile the Soviet Union has indeed submitted more than one proposal at the talks in Geneva. Our present initiatives seem to crown and to develop the proposals submitted earlier on questions of nuclear and space armaments. So you can decide who said A and who said B, but the main thing here is something else. The main thing is whether the U.S. side is finally ready to seriously consider and to resolve on a mutually acceptable basis the questions which are the subject of the talks in Geneva in accord with the agreement reached in January.

[CSSR radio's (Stefan Babak) (Stefan Babek), Radio Czechoslovakia. According to the Soviet proposal, the Soviet Union is to keep 1,250 nuclear weapon carriers while the United States is to keep 1,680. Can you explain in detail the reasons for this disparity?

[Akhromeyev] Comrade Babak, if I may point out very briefly, this chart here explains everything, in general.

[look at] the one on your left. I shall explain briefly. With a ban on the testing, creation, and deployment [razvertyvaniye] of offensive space armaments, we propose a reduction of 50 percent in the Soviet and U.S. nuclear weapons capable of reaching each other's territory. At the same time, the Soviet Union agrees to a certain U.S. advantage in the number of carriers. As you see, with this proposal the United States keeps 1,680 carriers and the Soviet Union 1,250. But we have agreed to this

bearing in mind that, after a 50 percent reduction in nuclear weapon carriers, the sides will have identical numbers of nuclear warheads -- 6,000 each. This would ensure an approximate strategic balance between the Soviet Union and the United States.

[Zamyatin] A question from the correspondent of the FRG press agency DEUTSCHE PRESS AGENTUR. The United States asserts that research and other work is being conducted in the Soviet Union corresponding to the U.S. SDI program. The Soviet side has repeatedly denied this assertion. Would the Soviet Union agree to international on-site verification in order to prove that it is right?

[Akhromeyev] They are still not agreeing to hold talks with us on the question of space weapons. They are still not agreeing not just to seek an agreement, but even to hold talks. We are engaged only in conversations; at the same time the question is being asked about international verification. I think that DPA would be better off turning to the U.S. side and asking: Do they intend to ban the development, the creation, and deployment [razvertyaniye] of space weapons, offensive space weapons? And if they do agree to this and there is an accord, then there will also be international verification of the fulfillment of such an agreement. [end recording]

Description of Video

LD222321 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1605 GMT on 22 October broadcasts a 35-minute report on the Moscow press conference held to present the Soviet arms proposals.

The video reportage shows Korniyenko, Zamyatin, and Akhromeyev seated left to right behind a long desk facing the audience. Slightly behind them sits an unidentified official.

On the wall behind the speakers are two large diagrams with bar charts, showing the relative sizes of U.S. and Soviet nuclear forces before and after the proposed reductions.

The right-hand chart has the following data: As of 1 September 85 NATO has a total of 3000 warheads; 1,015 means of delivery with 628 aircraft, the United States has 596, France 32; and 387 missiles, the United States has 209, Britain 64, and France 114. The USSR has a total of 2,000 warheads; 850 means of delivery including 477 aircraft and 373 missiles, of which 243 are SS-20s. Smaller bar charts show the relative sizes of numbers of warheads, missiles, and aircraft after reduction to equal levels, but no precise data can be discerned.

The left-hand chart indicates how the strategic balance is made up of different components for the two sides. Bar charts show the relative sizes at present and after the proposed 50 percent reduction. Only the "after reduction" part is seen in closeup. Under the heading "USA" there is the figure 6,000 with a pictogram of a warhead, and the figure 1,680 with pictograms of a large missile, a small missile, a fighter-bomber, a heavy bomber, and a submarine. Underneath are the words: Strategic Offensive Weapons, Medium-Range Missiles, and Forward-Based Means.

Under the heading "USSR" there is the figure 6,000 with a pictogram of a warhead, and the figure 1,250 with pictograms of a large missile, a heavy bomber, and a submarine. Underneath are the words: Strategic Nuclear Forces.

The charts are seen in long-shot behind the speakers and only briefly in closeup. The speakers are seen in long-shot and closeup. Pieces of paper, presumably with questions, are passed to Zamyatin. There are frequent shots of the audience.

PRAVDA Report

PM231620 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Oct 85 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Press Conference in Moscow: Curbing the Arms Race"]

[Text] A press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists was held in Moscow 22 October in connection with the new Soviet proposals on questions of space and nuclear arms. The conference was conducted by G.M. Korniyenko, USSR first deputy foreign minister; Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev, chief of the Armed Forces General Staff and first deputy defense minister; and L.M. Zamyatin, chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Information Department.

Opening the press conference, L.M. Zamyatin said: The USSR, guided by the desire to create conditions for the adoption of practical measures which would make it possible to curb the arms race and defuse the explosive situation in the world, has advanced concrete proposals at the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva on the entire range of problems related to space and nuclear -- both strategic and medium-range -- armaments.

The essence of these proposals was set forth by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev in his statements in Paris.

Proposals for preventing the creation [sozdaniye] and deployment of space strike weapons and radically cutting the nuclear armaments of the USSR and the United States which reach their respective territories constitute the core of the new Soviet initiatives. Combined with our previous actions, these proposals make up a complex of concrete constructive measures, the implementation of which would bring a genuine turn in the development of international relations, termination of the arms race on earth and its prevention in outer space.

The new Soviet proposals found approval from political and public circles in practically all countries. They view these proposals as a way toward improving the world situation and diminishing the threat of nuclear war looming over mankind. The interest in the Soviet proposals is particularly high on the eve of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, which gives an opportunity for adopting major decisions on the questions of curbing the arms race and effecting a turn for the better in the existing international situation.

By advancing such radical proposals on space and nuclear armaments, the Soviet Union is pressing only for fair and honest accords; it is not looking for any military advantages.

Our initiatives are in full accord with the well-known January agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States. One has to state, however, that certain circles, above all in the United States, are seeking to generate doubt as to what prompted the Soviet Union to make these proposals.

At today's press conference, we are prepared to answer the questions you probably have in connection with the new Soviet proposals.

Question: It is claimed in the West that it is possible to reach agreement first on a considerable cut in nuclear weapons. As a result, it is claimed there is no need to make this possibility conditional on a ban on space weapons. What can be said in this connection?

Answer: It became possible once to conclude the interim SALT I agreement and the SALT II Treaty because the antiballistic missile (ABM) systems of the sides were limited. The ABM Treaty says that "effective measures to limit ABM systems are an essential factor in containing the race of strategic offensive weapons."

The point at issue at that time was only land-based antiballistic defense; there was no question of outer space basing. The situation has changed now. The United States has announced its intention to create a global ABM system with space-based elements. Its aim is to ensure for the United States the ability to launch with impunity the first nuclear strike against the Soviet Union while depriving it of the possibility of delivering a counterstrike.

Under these conditions accepting any limitations, still less sharp reductions, of strategic offensive armaments without an accord on the banning of space strike armaments means disregarding the Soviet Union's security. We shall never agree to that.

The ban on the creation [sozdaniye] of space strike armaments is a key, top priority question. In his interview with TIME magazine, M.S. Gorbachev said that unless there is an agreement on the nonmilitarization of space, it will not be possible to reach an agreement on nuclear arms limitation and reduction. This is our firm position.

Question: How is one to explain the fact that representatives of the U.S. Administration stubbornly call the new Soviet proposals put forward by M.S. Gorbachev in Paris "counterproposals"?

Answer: The explanation here is simple -- Washington would very much like to avoid responsibility for the fact that through its fault there has been no progress whatever at the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms. So they try to create the impression that the United States had previously submitted some proposals of its own, but the USSR is only just doing so now.

In actual fact, since the beginning of the Geneva talks the U.S. side has not submitted a single new proposal there. In the section concerning nuclear arms -- strategic and medium-range -- it has merely reiterated the positions it set out at the previous talks, which were wrecked by the United States. And in the section concerning space, it has shown a readiness to talk only generally about what a universal "paradise" will begin when the United States creates [sozdat] its "space shield." If those are proposals, what do you call obstruction?

But the Soviet Union has actually submitted more than one proposal at the talks. Our present initiatives are a sort of culmination and development of previous proposals on questions of nuclear and space armaments.

Question: Can you confirm that the Soviet Union is doing research work similar to the U.S. SDI program, and what purpose does the work serve?

Answer: We are not doing work to create [sozdaniye] space strike weapons and we are not developing [razrabatyvat] an ABM system for the country. Our country is carrying out fundamental research work in the field of space, work on creating [sozdaniye] and improving early-warning, reconnaissance, communications, navigation, and meteorological space systems. In short, we have no "star wars" programs like the U.S. ones. The USSR is punctilious in its fulfillment of the Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Systems.

Question: It is known that the United States is continuing nuclear tests after the Soviet moratorium on its nuclear explosions. How might events develop in the future?

Answer: When the Soviet Union introduced its unilateral moratorium, as of 6 August, on all nuclear explosions, it was announced that it will be in force until 1 January 1986, but will remain in force in the United States follows our example. So Washington was given 6 months "for reflection."

The U.S. representatives do not want to halt nuclear weapon tests and they usually cites the problem of verification. But this is just an excuse. The real reason for their reluctance was indicated in an official letter from the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to U.S. Congress on 7 September 1983. Claiming that ending nuclear weapon tests would not be in the "best interests of the United States," the authors of the letter frankly explained this by saying that "nuclear tests are necessary specifically for the development, modernization, and testing of the suitability of warheads." You can't be clearer than that.

As for the possibility of verifying the cessation of nuclear tests -- in which, incidentally, we are certainly no less interested than the United States -- suffice it to cite the following fact. Soon after we introduced our moratorium there was an explosion at the Nevada test range on which no reports have been published in the United States to this day. Evidently they were hoping that, because of its low yield, the explosion would go undetected so it would be possible to say: There you see, without onsite inspection you get nowhere. But, in the USSR the explosion was registered, despite its low yield, and the U.S. Government knows it. However, it prefers to keep quiet about it.

Question: The United States claims that strategic military parity has now been violated and the Soviet Union has military superiority today. What can you say about the military balance?

Answer: The propaganda about Soviet military superiority has one purpose -- to justify the buildup of the military preparations of the United States and the NATO bloc in general. The truth is, there is an approximate military equilibrium between the sides today. The equilibrium of Soviet and U.S. strategic nuclear forces was verified during the elaboration of the SALT II treaty and officially stated in 1979, when the treaty was signed. The number of the sides' strategic delivery vehicles shows no change from 1979. The USSR has a few more than the United States (2,504:2,210), but the United States still has far more charges on them. Generally speaking, there is an approximate balance.

Now, about medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe. The United States has already deployed 209 missiles in Western Europe (81 Pershings and 128 cruise missiles). In all, the NATO countries have 387 medium-range missiles in Europe. They have 739 warheads on them. In the European zone the USSR has 373 missiles, including 243 SS-20 missiles. Counting aircraft, NATO has more medium-range delivery vehicles in Europe than the Warsaw Pact (1,015:850) and more nuclear charges (approximately 3,000:2,000). Taking into account the differences in composition of the sides' nuclear armaments, one can talk of an approximate balance in this area as well.

As for conventional armaments, NATO is ahead of the Warsaw Pact in terms of the total numerical strength of the armed forces, the number of combat-ready divisions and antitank facilities, and it has approximately the same amount of artillery and armored equipment. In the Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces there are a few more tactical aircraft than there are in NATO.

Thus, the approximate military balance between the sides is an objective reality. It is confirmed by competent sources in the West.

Question: Of late, in connection with the SDI program, various interpretations of the ABM Treaty have been heard from Washington. How do they differ and which of them is nearest to the truth?

Answer: The truth is that under Article I of the ABM Treaty the parties pledged "not to deploy ABM systems for the defense of the territory of their country and not to provide [sozdavat] a base for such a defense." Under Article V of the treaty they pledged "not to develop [sozdavat], test, or deploy ABM systems or components which are sea-based, air-based, space-based, or mobile land-based." The SDI program contravenes the ABM Treaty on two counts and -- what is more -- in a most flagrant fashion. First, because the aim is to create an ABM system for the whole country and, furthermore, for the U.S. allies' territories, which is prohibited under Article I of the Treaty. And second, because it is a question of space-based ABM defense system, which is prohibited under Article V.

In an attempt to cloud this absolutely clear issue, certain people in Washington cite one of the statements appended to the treaty, the so-called Statement D, which allegedly permits the creation [sozdaniye] of ABM means based on other physical principles than the ABM means limited by the treaty. And, because under the SDI program the development [razrabotka] of precisely such fundamentally new ABM means as lasers, directed energy beams, and so forth is under way, the program, they claim, does not contravene the treaty.

This, so to speak, is manipulation for political aims. Statement D does indeed exist. And it does indeed contain the words "ABM means based on other physical principles."

But the whole point is that the possibility of the emergency of such means is allowed only in respect to the limited ABM areas permitted by the treaty and to stationary land-based systems. The text of Statement D allows no other interpretation. It is not just we who are saying this, but also those U.S. figures who directly participated in the elaboration of the ABM Treaty.

Question: U.S. Administration spokesmen are saying that the Soviet proposal for a 50 percent reduction necessitates a radical restructuring of the U.S. strategic offensive arms "triad." Is this really so?

Answer: No, it is not. The 50 percent reduction applies in equal measure to Soviet and U.S. nuclear arms capable of reaching the other's territory. It does not set any one-sided conditions regarding the structure of the reductions. The sides themselves can decide which arms component is to be reduced and to what extent, and what the nuclear arms structure will be after the cuts.

The proposal not to deploy more than 60 percent of the total number of 6,000 permitted charges on any one of the components of the remaining nuclear means (ICBM's, SLBM's, and heavy bombers) does not necessitate a radical restructuring of strategic nuclear forces either. The sides will have equal opportunities to reduce strategic nuclear forces in light of their existing structure and to establish a balance in respect to the permitted number of nuclear charges.

Question: U.S. officials constantly accuse the USSR of having an operational ABM system. What are they driving at?

Answer: Correct, the USSR has an ABM system in the area of the capital. We have never denied this; its existence is in strict conformity with the ABM Treaty. When, however, people in Washington speak about this Soviet system in a context designed to cast aspersions on the observance of the treaty by the Soviet Union, this contravenes elementary decency.

Especially, since the United States also has an ABM system for one area, we have never reproached them with this as they have the same right to this as the USSR. References to the fact that this U.S. system is "mothballed" change nothing because the "PAR" phased array radar station remains in operation and the mothballed ABM launchpads could be de-mothballed at any time. It is for this reason that the treaty makes no distinction between ABM components whether they are operational or mothballed.

Question: The U.S. Administration claims the SDI program is "highly moral" because it allegedly could rid mankind of nuclear weapons and is designed for use not against people but, according to Washington, against missiles ("missiles against missiles"). What can you say on this score?

Answer: The theory of "missiles against missiles, not against people" is a deception based on people's fear of nuclear weapons. If you discard the propaganda and reveal the essence of the U.S. SDI program you will see that it pursues a perfidious aim, namely, the acquisition by the United States of the ability to deliver with impunity a nuclear strike against the USSR after depriving it of the possibility of delivering a retaliatory strike. What is moral about this?

Just as the appearance of nuclear weapons did not lead to the elimination of conventional weapons, so space strike arms will not deliver mankind from nuclear weapons. The authors of SDI are well aware of that. There is an objective interconnection between the development [razvitiye] of offensive and defensive strategic systems. The creation [sozda ye] and deployment of strike arms in space and of an ABM defense of the country on the basis will inevitably lead to an increase in the number of strategic offensive arms and their qualitative improvement.

That is why the SDI program will give rise to an uncontrolled arms race in all salients.

Question: Are there such things as "more destabilizing" and "less destabilizing" weapons systems? What systems do you class as "more destabilizing"?

Answer: The concept of "more and less destabilizing" arms is an invention of the present U.S. Administration. This question was not raised by the Nixon, Ford, or Carter administrations.

Now, the White House classes as "more destabilizing" those means which are most developed in the USSR and constitute its combat might -- in particular, the Soviet ICBM's -- which, according to U.S. criteria, should be eliminated; but those means in which the United States is strong -- submarine-launched ballistic missiles and heavy bombers each carrying 20-28 long-range cruise missiles -- are classed as means of "stability and security."

Today, all strategic means are coming to resemble each other in terms of destructive capabilities. There is no difference between our ICBM's and the U.S. Trident SLBM's in terms of combat effectiveness (range, accuracy, yield of warheads). The United States prefers to keep quiet about the combat effectiveness of the sea-based Trident I and Trident II missiles because their potential is equal to that of our ICBM's. That is why strategic arms (ICBM's, SLBM's, heavy bombers) should be considered together, as

a single whole. That is the fundamental basis for talks. It makes it possible to elaborate an equal agreement which is not detrimental to either side, on the condition, of course, of a total ban on space strike arms.

But, if we are talking about "destabilizing means," they will be the maneuverable warheads, "invisible" heavy bombers, and air-launched supersonic cruise missiles with a range of more than 4,000 km which are being developed [razrabatyvayemye] in the United States.

Question: Is not the linkage between the Soviet proposal for sharp reductions in strategic arms and the demand for a ban on work on SDI an insuperable obstacle at the Geneva talks?

Answer: When the subject and objectives of the Geneva talks were defined in January of this year, the sides agreed the subject of the talks would be the complex of questions concerning space and nuclear arms; that all these questions would be examined and resolved as an interconnected whole.

Our formulation of the SDI question is also based entirely on what the sides agreed in January, namely: The purpose of the talks must be to elaborate effective agreements aimed at preventing an arms race in space and stopping it on earth.

So the insuperable -- as you put it -- obstacle at the Geneva talks is the U.S. refusal to adhere to that accord; not the other way around.

Question: Under the Soviet proposal the USSR is to reduce its nuclear delivery vehicles by 1,250, and the United States by 1,680. Why the difference?

Answer: In the context of a ban on the testing, creation [sozdaniye], and deployment of space strike arms, we propose a 50 percent reduction in the nuclear arms of the USSR and the United States capable of reaching each other's territory. The USSR consents to some superiority for the United States in terms of the number of delivery vehicles (1,680:1,250). We have done so bearing in mind that after the 50 percent reduction in nuclear delivery vehicles the sides will have an identical number of nuclear charges -- 6,000 units each. This would ensure an approximate strategic equilibrium between the USSR and the United States.

Question: The NEW YORK TIMES observer Gelb, after his recent conversations in Moscow, including conversations with officials present here, reported a number of hitherto unmentioned features in the USSR's position. Do his reports correspond to reality?

Answer: We regarded Gelb as a very competent observer on military issues. We received him as such. But this time, unfortunately, on the one hand, Gelb perpetrated major inaccuracies in his reports when setting forth what his Soviet interlocutors told him, and on the other hand, he displayed surprising incompetence. For instance, he counts among the heavy Soviet missiles not only the SS-18, but the SS-19, although not even Mr Perle went as far as to think that.

The participants in the press conference also answered other questions from journalists.

CSO: 5200/1057

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR: FURTHER ON U.S. RESPONSE TO GORBACHEV PROPOSALS

'Improper Maneuvers'

PM080920 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 7 Oct 85 First Edition p 3

[Yuriy Kornilov "Commentary on the Chief Event": "Still in the Same Black Hat? Call for Disarmament; Washington: Improper Maneuvers"]

[Text] "M.S. Gorbachev: Peace, Peace, Peace!"--These words set in uppercase type decorate the front page of a recent issue of L'HUMANITE. You probably could not describe more succinctly and accurately the results of the Soviet leader's visit to France: This visit, which took place in a businesslike, constructive atmosphere, and the Soviet-French summit talks really provided most vivid and convincing evidence of the Soviet Union's firm will for peace and detente and its unbending determination to ensure that the needle on the international political barometer, which in recent days has been getting closer and closer to the "Stormy" mark, steadily indicates "Fair." Widely discussing and commenting on the results of the visit and the USSR's new large-scale foreign policy initiatives advanced in Paris, prominent politicians and public figures in various countries and the press emphasize that the Soviet Union is signposting a real way to halt the "hellish train" of the arms race and to strengthen the peoples' security. It is pointed out that the meetings and talks between M.S. Gorbachev and F. Mitterrand serve as an important boost to deepening relations between the two countries and strengthening trust in East-West relations.

Here are just a few assessments of the new Soviet initiatives, extracted by us from the growing stream of international reactions to the results of the Soviet-French dialogue. G. Howe, Britain's secretary of state for foreign and commonwealth affairs: "The Soviet ideas are positive." E. Bahr, prominent FRG politician and public figure: "The USSR's proposal to completely ban space strike arms for both sides and to reduce really radically, by 50 percent, nuclear arms which can reach each other's territory mark a tremendous positive step in the direction of genuine disarmament." The Netherlands Labor Party: "The new Soviet initiatives make it possible to impart dynamism to the whole process of the talks on limiting the arms race."

This is how all sober-minded people react to the broad program advanced by the Soviet country for improving the international situation. But what is the reaction of official Washington? People there have undoubtedly been forced to reckon with the very broad positive international response elicited by the new Soviet initiatives and, evidently, this is precisely why people on the banks of the Potomac have deemed it proper this time not to resort to the previous method whereby any proposals from Moscow were straightway declared "propaganda." Now the world hears different formulas from Washington: "We must analyze the Soviet proposals in earnest." Progress? It would seem so. But this is what is noteworthy: At the same time as one high-ranking administration spokesman speaks of the need to "analyze the content of the Soviet initiatives," a number of no less high-ranking spokesmen for the same administration make one statement after another from which it follows that in fact they are concerned not so much with studying these initiatives in an earnest and businesslike way as with distorting their purport and belittling their significance...

News agencies had barely had time to report the new Soviet proposals before the U.S. President, who was touring the state of Ohio, not only declared in an interview that these proposals "do not provide for the destruction of arms" but also attempted once again to intimidate the West European NATO partners by putting into circulation the fabrication that Soviet missiles "targeted on Europe" pose a "threat" to West European countries. The next day the U.S. State Department made similar allegations. At the same time, as though at a command, the American bourgeois press began zealously running in its pages a false State Department and Pentagon story alleging, contrary to the facts, that the Soviet Union is "implementing a broad program for the development [razrabotka] of space strike arms." In another speech, this time in New Jersey, the U.S. President confirmed that the United States intends to continue pursuing at an accelerated pace the policy of turning space into an arena for militarist adventures. And Vice President G. Bush, who in fact declared that it is necessary to "analyze the Soviet proposals in earnest," at once went into reverse and proclaimed that Washington, remembering Churchill's appeals, should conduct affairs with the USSR from a "position of strength." Bush also disconcerted his listeners with an essentially provocative question: Do the Soviet proposals really envisage an arms reduction, or is this just an "illusion."

How are we supposed to evaluate all this? Let us hear what Western, including American, politicians and press organs have to say. P. Warnke, former director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency: "Some opponents of arms control in the Reagan administration engage in lightly rejecting Soviet proposals without even investigating their essence." The American ABC-TV Company: "The administration reacts hastily and too negatively to any proposal by the Soviet Union in the arms control sphere." The Japanese NHK-TV Corporation: "The White House continues to perceive the Soviet initiatives as meeting the interests of just one side." So, do we see the old policy of blocking and obstruction with regard to any proposals aimed at improving the political climate? It is hard to rid yourself of the impression that some people in the United States are scared of the very possibility of accords in Geneva and of the prospect that, perhaps, they will have to reduce weapons production and moderate their military appetites...

In a recent television interview the U.S. President made the point that as a result of the USSR's propaganda "intrigues" the Soviet Union has ended up in a white hat, and he, Reagan, in a black one. "This is an old Hollywood ploy," he declared, "when the negative hero is distinguished by the color of his hat." Of course, the ploys of American cinema are well known to the president, who began his career in Hollywood, but international affairs, on whose conduct the very fate of human civilization depends today, would not be likened to a Hollywood smash hit, and the international public certainly does not wish to appear in the role of a nonparticipant viewer of such subjects. And if the U.S. administration is appearing before this public in the role of "negative hero," this is the fault not of anyone's "malicious propaganda" but of the aggressive, hegemonist policy of the American administration itself--a policy which arouses the resolute opposition of the peoples which advocate peace and the relaxation of international tension. Unfortunately, the first reaction of certain U.S. circles to the new Soviet initiatives attests that Washington is not prepared to make any substantial amendments to this policy.

The facts and the whole course of international events confirm over and over again a most important political axiom of the nuclear era: With all the different political systems, ideologies, and world outlooks in different states, the planet is now faced with the need to seek paths to a world which will be characterized by trust, mutual understanding, and cooperation. Our country is ready for this.

West European Response

LD082022 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 8 Oct 85

[Commentary by station political observer Aleksandr Zholkver]

[Text] Statesmen and public figures from many countries are continuing a wide-ranging discussion of the major peace initiatives proposed by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev during his visit to France. Over to our political observer Aleksandr Zholkver:

In connection with the days of the Soviet Union in the major West German town of Mannheim I have spent the past week in the FRG, and it should be said that during the whole of this week the Soviet leader's visit to France and the Soviet Union's new proposals on arms limitation set out by him were the focus of the West German public's attention. The SPD leadership has only just adopted a special decision in support of these proposals, calling on the FRG Government to make a contribution to curbing the arms race.

Such appeals are not only being heard in the FRG. In the United States itself a group of prominent politicians, including Harriman, the elder statesman of U.S. diplomacy, and two prominent experts on questions of foreign and military policy, Schlesinger and Ball, have called on President Reagan to associate himself with the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions. But it is impossible to ignore the fact that other

voices are also being heard. In this connection the latest speech by the British Secretary-General of NATO Lord Carrington is noteworthy. He has only just held talks in Washington with President Reagan and Secretary of State Shultz. Immediately afterwards he made an extensive statement on the USSR's new proposals. Carrington cannot but recognize their great significance--he even calls them a step forward. All the same, paradoxical as it may seem, the Atlantic leader calls for their rejection. Why? Because it is allegedly propaganda and an attempt to drive a wedge into the Western alliance. First, the one seems to exclude the other. If this is all simply propaganda, then what does the Western alliance have to fear? Secondly, why would the United States and its NATO allies themselves not get involved in such propaganda--halting nuclear explosions, reducing nuclear weapons by one half. For all sides could only benefit from this--the United States and Western Europe. If someone is driving a wedge between them, then it is being done only by those who, as before, are speeding up the arms race, thereby really provoking an increase in anti-American feelings which I have now been observing in the FRG.

Now in the world arena two paths are particularly clearly manifest: Our country's path for strengthening peace, and on the other hand the rather clumsy attempts to justify and continue the arms race, which is unpopular among the peoples.

Clear, Honest Response Demanded

LD100122 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 9 Oct 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast: Video commentary by publicist Vitaliy Kobysh]

[Text] [Kobysh] Hello, comrades. World public reaction to the Soviet proposals shows that they have been perceived as a resolute and bold step by the Soviet Union. They break, as it were, that enchanted circle in which the problem of disarmament has found itself over the past decade, and maybe even longer.

Our country, as you know, has proposed that strike space weapons be completely prohibited for both sides and that there be a radical 50 percent reduction in nuclear armaments capable of reaching each other's territory. Besides this, in order to limit the quantity of medium-range missile weapons in Central Europe, the Soviet Union has proposed that a separate agreement be worked out on this problem, which would be solved without linkage to space and strategic armaments. It was proposed that talks be started not only with the United States, but also with France and Britain, who, as it is well known, possess their own nuclear-missiles potential. Let me remind you, too, that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev announced during a speech in Paris: We have removed that number of SS-20 missiles from combat duty which were deployed additionally as a countermeasure to the deployment of American missiles in West European countries. This is a further act of goodwill on our part.

So, we have put forward clear, realistic, and honest proposals which demand an equally clear and honest response. I would like to draw your attention to the fact that the Soviet proposals were put forward on the eve of the November Soviet-American Geneva summit meeting. Their aim is to create the conditions for a cessation of the arms race on earth and in space, and to secure a breakthrough in international relations.

This in effect, I repeat, is how the new Soviet initiatives were perceived throughout the world. This is how they were appraised in the conversations that French President Mitterrand had with the head of the CPSU. Now, just a few days after the Paris talks, certain people in Washington, despite the fact that U.S. President Reagan has repeatedly advocated a reduction in armaments, have been attempting to cancel out the significance of what was said in the French capital and to brush aside the new Soviet proposals. Incidentally, it is obviously not very easy to brush them aside. American Government circles are openly complaining that it is impossible in practice to find any convincing counter-arguments to the Soviet proposals.

Such officials as McFarlane, the Presidential assistant, and Assistant Secretary of Defense Perle have been engaged in this impossible task. The former, justifying the plans for deploying strike weapons in space, was trying to prove a couple of days ago that this, allegedly, does not contravene the 1972 ABM agreement. However, if he were to glance at Article 5 of the treaty, he would see that this is completely at variance with the treaty. As for Perle, and certain other proteges like him of the military-industrial complex, they are now engaged in one task alone; namely, how to find any loopholes in the Soviet proposals and get the Soviet-American talks deadlocked.

Let us hope, however, that Perle and those like him do not constitute America, and that the Soviet proposals will be attentively studied in Washington and become the subject of serious business-like discussions in Geneva.

U.S. Objections Rebutted

LD101731 Moscow World Service in English 1410 GMT 10 Oct 85

[Announcer-read commentary by Yuriy Solton]

[Text] Political figures and the media in different countries continue to discuss the Soviet program for improving the world situation put forward by the general secretary of the Soviet Communist Party, Mikhail Gorbachev, in the course of his recent visit to France. More on this from Yuriy Solton:

The emphasis is made on the Soviet approach to reductions in strategic nuclear arsenals. This involves weapons capable of reaching Soviet and American territory. The USSR suggests that Soviet and American strategic nuclear forces be cut by 50 percent and that an agreement be reached simultaneously on total banning all strike space weapons on both sides.

The proposals are based on the principle of equality and like security. They don't upset the approximate military parity between the USSR and the United States but aim at sharply lowering its level. This ("means") that strategic stability will strengthen and the ultimate goal--a total ban on nuclear weaponry and the liquidation of its stockpiles--will draw nearer.

This is how the Soviet proposals are assessed by all those who evaluate them objectively without prejudice. There are many such people in the United States also. Nevertheless, another reaction is in evidence there too. The representatives of military-industrial complex and those who reflect its sentiments in the administration in their attempts to keep to the schedule of arms buildup are seeking to distort the essence of the Soviet proposals, to dismiss them.

For example, they claim that it's not right to include in the strategic equalization the American Pershing II's and cruise missiles under deployment in the vicinity of the Soviet frontiers and the airborne nuclear weapon systems. They refer to the Soviet SS-20 missiles stationed in the European part of the USSR. But these missiles don't reach the territory of the United States. As for the Pershing II's and cruise missiles, they, along-side other American forward based means, are designed to hit targets deep inside the Soviet Union. For the Soviet Union, they're a strategic weapon. To leave them beyond the bounds of the strategic balance would amount to giving the other side military advantages. The Soviet Union can't agree to this.

Washington's repeated statements in defense of the star wars program are equally alarming. It's very unlikely that the supporters of the program don't realize the fact that should the arms race be taken to outer space, the possibility of stopping it on the earth will be ruled out. That's why they have resorted to a falsehood, claiming that the Soviet Union has a similar program. The Soviet Union has said officially more than once that it does not develop strike space weapons and it is strongly committed to the 1972 treaty limiting antimissile defense systems. Even if we imagine that the Soviet Union has a program similar to that of the United States, why then shouldn't the Americans, who say they sincerely want disarmament, accept the Soviet offer of a ban on strike space means?

The Soviet Union unilaterally announced a moratorium on putting anti-satellite weapons in space. In other unilateral moves, it has dramatically cut the number of its SS-20 missiles and suspended nuclear explosions. Now it has put forward concrete proposals which, if accepted, will open up a possibility to break the vicious circle of the arms race and prevent the militarization of outer space. The ball is in the American court.

Not Meant To 'Outplay" U.S.

LD101954 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 10 Oct 85

["News Commentary" by Viktor Levin]

[Text] Weinberger, U.S. defense secretary, has declared that the new Soviet proposals for a 50 percent reduction in strategic nuclear armaments are unsatisfactory for the United States. According to a DPA report from Washington, Weinberger explained his position by saying that acceptance of the Soviet proposals would hinder the implementation of the program for the modernization of U.S. armaments. Here is a "news commentary". At the microphone is Viktor Levin:

First, I should like to recall what the Soviet Union has proposed. As Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said in Paris, we have proposed to the U.S. Government that agreement be reached on a full ban on strike space armaments for both sides and on a really radical, 50 percent reduction in the nuclear armaments capable of reaching the other side's territory. What is proposed here is a practical attainment of the tasks jointly agreed by the Soviet Union and United States as the aims of the Geneva talks: the tasks not only of halting the arms race, but also cutting the level of armaments sharply and at the same time averting an arms race in space.

Like other specific Soviet proposals aimed at curbing the arms race, this proposal is being viewed by international public opinion and by prominent politicians and public figures in many countries as a substantial and realistic step and as a manifestation of Soviet good will and willingness to achieve a mutually acceptable accord on the basis of equality and the identical security of the sides.

After all, we are not talking about the United States doing more than the Soviet Union is prepared to take upon itself: a 50 percent reduction in the strategic armaments of both sides in circumstances of their effective parity is being proposed. As Weinberger's statement shows, however, the Pentagon sees this as encroaching on its interests. We will not be able to implement the program for the modernization of our armaments, the U.S. defense secretary says.

However, it has been no secret for a long time now that the specific aim of what Weinberger calls modernization is attainment of military superiority through a feverish build-up of armaments. In other words, the plans of the U.S.'s military departments are connected not with halting the arms race, but with intentions to accelerate the infernal engine of the arms race even further.

Of course, those whose desires are associated with intentions to create new piles of armaments can find no cheer in the Soviet proposals. But how much can one irresponsibly play with the destinies of the world? Even in the United States itself, people are seriously pondering this question today. The defense secretary is clearly striving to cast aspersions on the Soviet Union's proposals which are honest and absolutely equal to the two sides. It is as if he were unaware that Comrade Gorbachev recently stressed again that we do not want to outplay the United States. We do not advise them to attempt the same thing either.

PM111146 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 11 Oct 85 Second Edition p 3

[**"TASS commentary for KRASNAYA ZVEZDA" by TASS military observer V. Chernyshev: "Unscrupulous Approach"**]

[Text] The new Soviet proposals announced by M.S. Gorbachev during his visit to France have received broad approval by the peace-loving public of the planet. They have been seen throughout the world as a specific and constructive program for disarmament and consolidation of international security. Under these circumstances, there is a perfectly natural interest in official Washington's response to the Soviet proposals. So, here is the initial reaction as formulated by a high-ranking spokesman of the U.S. administration at a White House briefing. According to him, the U.S. president considers that "the actual fact that the Soviet Union has put forward the proposals is a very promising development...and that the time has come for serious work in Geneva."

There is no doubt that such an approach would accord with the interests of both sides.

It appeared, however, that the aim of the U.S. spokesman's statement was to "prove" that the Soviet proposals are supposedly "unequal," do not provide the basis for future agreements, and are in essence unacceptable to certain U.S. circles.

The implementation of the Soviet proposal for a 50 percent cut in USSR and U.S. nuclear weapons capable of reaching each other's territory would result in the Soviet Union "retaining major advantages" in nuclear weapons, the spokesman prophesied, presenting for the sake of greater "credibility" a mass of figures and "calculations" to prove how "badly off" the United States would find itself in nuclear weapons as a result of such reductions.

As far as these figures are concerned, they are--to put it mildly--incorrect. It is sufficient to point out only a few of them as an example. The number of U.S. heavy bombers is not 263 as stated at the briefing, but 509, while the USSR has about 150 and not 480 of them. And the total numbers of ICBM's, submarine launched ballistic missiles, and heavy bombers in the United States and the USSR are not 1,893 and 2,832, but 2,210 and 2,504 respectively. As regards the number of nuclear charges [zaryad], the U.S. arsenal exceeds the Soviet arsenal by several thousand units.

Where, and for what purpose, is the U.S. spokesman "concealing" in his calculations the air-launched cruise missiles, for example? After all, each U.S. heavy bomber could carry 20 such units, and their total number could be as high as 8,000-10,000 units.

The "calculations" presented at the briefing were clearly unscrupulous--let's reduce ours, and increase the partner's.

Unscrupulousness is to be clearly seen in something else, too. The U.S. spokesman attempted to give the impression that following reductions under the Soviet plan, the sides would supposedly find themselves in an unequal position and that the "blame" for this lies in the fact that it is proposed to include in the U.S. arsenal subject to reductions the forward-based U.S. means in Europe and Asia and its medium-range missiles being deployed in West Europe. After all, following a 50 percent cut the United States would be limited to "just" 1,680 delivery vehicles, he lamented, and if the forward-based means and medium-range missiles were excluded from the aforementioned number, then the so-called strategic "triad" (ICBM's, ballistic missiles on submarines, and heavy bombers) would be left with but 531 units.

This means, the high-ranking spokesman complains, that it will be cut by over 50 percent, in other words by a larger percentage than the USSR strategic forces. A fully legitimate question arises in connection with this: Why should the United States, in actual fact, "retain the inviolability" of its forward-based means and medium-range missiles and reduce only elements of the strategic "triad"? Does the Soviet proposal oblige it to do this? No, this is not at all so. The cuts could be spread in any suitable fashion across the components of the U.S. arsenal of means capable of reaching USSR territory. This is in the hands of the U.S. administration. Thus the "argument" about "greater cuts" in the U.S. strategic "triad" is clearly farfetched.

The U.S. spokesman has no reasons at all for the pretense about being "badly off." After all, what is proposed is to include in calculations those U.S. nuclear weapon delivery vehicles which can reach USSR territory, in the same way as it is proposed to include on the Soviet Union's side those means which can reach U.S. territory.

Such U.S. weapons as the Pershing 2 and cruise missiles, including sea-based ones, being deployed in the immediate vicinity of the USSR, as well as air-launched nuclear weapon systems, are directly involved in the strategic equation. At the same time, it is perfectly clear that the Soviet SS-20 missiles cannot reach U.S. territory and are not strategic as regards the United States.

Using figures to "cloud" the essence of the matter, the U.S. spokesman avoids the main issue, the real fact that USSR territory is under dual threat stemming both from the U.S. "central nuclear systems," in other words its strategic "triad," and from the U.S. forward-based means and medium-range missiles. It was not for nothing that the U.S. spokesman asked the following question at the briefing: Could it be that the Soviet Union is legitimately striving to class our weapons in Europe as strategic and include them in the sum total of strategic forces for the simple reason that they are capable of striking against the Soviet Union's territory, while its own missiles cannot reach the United States?

In actual fact, the U.S. spokesman himself was forced to admit under a barrage of questions that if, as a result of the cuts, the United States were left with 1,680 delivery vehicles capable of reaching Soviet territory then, as the USSR has declared, it is prepared in such a case to retain only 1,250 of its own delivery vehicles, in other words the Soviet Union is agreeable to a certain U.S. "advantage" in delivery vehicle numbers. But, according to the Soviet proposal, the number of nuclear warheads on these delivery vehicles would be equal for both sides--6,000 units each--and this is the main point. Furthermore, the USSR proposal envisages that no single element of the strategic "triad" would contain more than 60 percent of the sum total of combat charges [boyezaryad].

This means that Soviet ICBM's could not carry more than 3,600 combat charges and, consequently, the number of ICBM's themselves could not be "threatening for the United States," as the administration spokesman attempted to assert contrary to the facts.

There is another amazing aspect to the U.S. spokesman's "explanations." When he attempted to "justify the inequitability" of including the U.S. forward-based means and medium-range missiles in the strategic balance of forces, he diligently tried to play down the role of these means. But when the issue touched upon the fact that they could be reduced while leaving a "large share" to the "triad," he opened fire by proving how important these nuclear means are "for the defense of West Europe."

A definite conclusion can be drawn from all that has been said so far: Official Washington is totally unwilling to undertake any cuts at all, neither in the strategic "triad," nor in forward-based means, nor in medium-range missiles. Thus all the verbosity about its alleged willingness to reduce nuclear arsenals remains nothing but empty words.

The high-ranking U.S. spokesman is also clearly alarmed by the fact that the Soviet proposal envisages the erection of a barrier in the way of a qualitative nuclear arms race. In his words, this part of the Soviet initiative "would prevent the implementation of the U.S. armed forces program."

The proposal to impose a total ban on both sides' space strike weapons does not "suit" certain U.S. circles, either. In the administration spokesman's opinion, it "is a serious obstacle hindering progress in Geneva, and the Soviet Union must abandon it." A truly peculiar logic: The spread of the arms race to space "must help" to curb the arms race! The Soviet Union has repeatedly declared at the most authoritative level that the transfer of the arms race to space will make it objectively impossible to reduce nuclear arsenals.

Thus, the "preliminary assessment" of the Soviet initiative, as presented by the high-ranking U.S. spokesman, shows that those individuals within the administration who reflect the mood of the U.S. military-industrial complex, while not speaking openly against the Soviet proposals as a whole, are attempting to subject them to unconstructive criticism, raise doubts

about them, and even discredit them. They are attacking the Soviet Union's proposal for 50 percent cuts of the sides' arsenals which, together with the proposal on the nonmilitarization of space, constitutes a key issue whose purpose is to put an end to the dangerous arms race and preserve the world from sliding dangerously toward nuclear confrontation.

And a U.S. correspondent was apparently perfectly justified in asking the U.S. administration spokesman at the briefing: Are you now afraid of their initiatives, and are you presenting all this in public simply because they (the Russians) have really managed to strike a note in people's hearts?

U.S. Professor in Support

LD122344 Moscow TASS in English 1245 GMT 12 Oct 85

[Text] San Francisco, 12 Oct (TASS)--TASS correspondent Yuriy Algunov reports: The Soviet proposal for a 50 percent cut in the nuclear arms of the USSR and the United States, which are capable of reaching the other's territory, deserves the highest mark and a careful study at the negotiating table, said Professor Sidney Drell of Standford University.

Speaking in a TASS interview, the well-known American scientist and public figure said the initiative for a balanced and drastic lowering of the level of nuclear confrontation between the Soviet Union and the United States had been hailed throughout the world.

Professor Drell said the Soviet proposal had come very timely in conditions where the war threat had continued to grow.

The two countries would of course have, he said, to reach agreement on what specific weapons systems they would have to reduce and to what levels.

It was to be hoped, Professor Drell said, that the Soviet initiatives would pave the way to progress at the talks on nuclear and space arms in Geneva.

The paramount task today, he added, was to reduce the war threat. But it would be impossible to fulfil it without both sides displaying flexibility and a constructive approach. There was just no other way the task could be accomplished, Professor Drell said.

He said there was a multitude of other important problems that could only be resolved by the joint efforts of the Soviet Union and the United States.

The American scientist said plans to militarize outer space were particularly dangerous. Implementing Ronald Reagan's "Strategic Defense Initiative," he said, would not be a guarantee against the outbreak of a nuclear war. International security could only be maintained through East-West political dialogue.

PRAVDA Commentary 13 October

PM151421 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Oct 85 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Arithmetic U.S.-Style"]

[Text] Washington, 12 Oct--The discussion of the new Soviet proposals to reduce by 50 percent the nuclear arms of the USSR and United States that can reach each other's territory is becoming more active in U.S. military-political circles. Without rejecting as a whole the major new initiatives put forward by the Soviet Union, the U.S. administration is making definite efforts to discredit them and is trying to demonstrate that they are "unacceptable in principle" to the United States and NATO.

The U.S. administration is worried by the enthusiasm with which even NATO countries treated these proposals. The West European capitals are voicing increasingly strongly their high assessments of the Soviet proposals and demands to respond to them constructively: The very scale of the nuclear arms reductions offered by the Russians is impressive... The program put forward by M.S. Gorbachev contains proposals capable of freeing the world from the arms race impasse... The Soviet leader put forward a number of proposals which their opponents cannot dismiss so lightly... The proposal to reduce the nuclear arsenals by 50 percent is so significant that it must be given a clear and sincere answer... So P. Nitze, consultant to the U.S. President and Secretary of State on arms reduction talks, set off for the West European NATO countries' capitals. The aim of his trip is to present the Soviet proposals to the allies in a distorted U.S. interpretation and put together--but only on Washington's basis--the "uniform approach" of the NATO countries to these proposals.

What is this "Washington basis." How is Washington trying to counter the clear and precise Soviet proposals? In what is it trying to involve its West European allies?

For instance, our proposals on a 50-percent reduction in USSR and U.S. nuclear armaments capable of reaching each other's territory is regarded in Washington as nothing less than the kind of proposal which "disrupts the constructive bases of talks." Furthermore, they are even saying that its implementation would "substantially increase the Soviet Union's capability to deliver a first nuclear strike," whereas the United States "does not possess" such a capability. Let us leave aside those numerical features cited by U.S. representatives to "back up" these claims of theirs. Let us just recall that the Soviet Union has more than once proposed to the United States adopting a commitment not to be first to use nuclear weapons against each other. The authors of the "U.S. "Argument" also forget that the USSR long ago adopted a unilateral commitment not to use nuclear weapons first. However, all these facts seem to be of no importance to U.S. representatives, who have set themselves the sole aim of playing down the importance of the clear-cut Soviet proposal.

In this connection it is relevant to point out the assessments that the Soviet proposals have received in the United States itself from people who are more sober in their views and do not need to create a "propaganda backdrop" to the approaching Soviet-U.S. summit. As the *WASHINGTON POST* has written, the "Soviet proposal as defined by Moscow presupposes a far more significant reduction of both sides' nuclear arsenals than anyone here (that is, in Washington) anticipated." Warner, a well-known Rand Research Corporation expert on strategic systems, has stated that the suggested limitations, particularly regarding nuclear warheads on ground-based weapons systems, would lead to startlingly profound reduction of the two sides' nuclear arsenals. If implemented, the expert asserts, these reductions would create the conditions to make the counterstrike forces highly invulnerable and thereby increase strategic stability. Neither side, another U.S. expert stresses, has ever before suggested such radical ways of resolving arms control problems by means of talks as the present Soviet proposals do.

Let us take another passage invented by the White House propagandists. At a special briefing they tried to "prove" to journalists that the Soviet proposals assume that the USSR has "every right to threaten Europe" while "poor" Europe, alas, "has no right to defend itself." Then the propagandists' pathetic "logical" constructs look like this: The United States faces a dilemma--to defend either itself or its allies, because after reductions of the order proposed by the Soviet Union the U.S. medium-range and forward based facilities "simply cannot resolve both tasks simultaneously."

It is highly indicative that the White House spokesman who gave the briefing in question warned correspondents not to quote him by name in the press but simply to call him a "senior administration official." Clearly, it is not very agreeable for him to sign his name to such a "theory."

The fact is that the Soviet Union's stance regarding medium-range nuclear facilities in Europe makes it possible to maintain the parity of forces in this region and ensure equality and identical security. The U.S. actions--the continuing deployment of U.S. Pershing-2 and cruise missiles on European soil--are aimed at upsetting this parity. The United States has already deployed 81 Pershing-2 missiles in the FRG and 128 cruise missiles on British, Italian, and Belgian territory. Including the nuclear missile potential belonging to Britain and France, NATO confronts the Soviet Union with 387 missiles armed with 739 warheads, that is, virtually the same number as the USSR has. The latter proceeds in its proposal from the notion of placing in the European part of the country as many missiles as the NATO countries have (counting in terms of warheads) and not a missile more.

But for the Pentagon this is not enough. The Pentagon believes that it must have its medium-range missiles in Europe at all costs and "forgets" that they belong to the category of strategic weapons with regard to the Soviet Union, whereas the Soviet medium-range missiles cannot reach U.S. territory and consequently are not strategic with regard to the United States. Where, then, is the "disruption of balance" as discussed by the

U.S. representatives? This is clearly an artificially invented issue. By means of these unfounded claims the Pentagon would like to consolidate itself on European territory with its first-strike missiles and ensure U.S. strategic superiority over the Soviet Union.

The administration "senior official" was asked: Is not the Soviet Union's demand that the long-range U.S. cruise missiles and Pershing-2s capable of striking Soviet territory be included in the facilities subject to reduction a fair and valid one? Not knowing how to extricate himself from this delicate situation, the senior official launched into vague reasoning: The abovementioned facilities "are important only in the context of the balance of forces in separate theaters of military operations and not in the strategic context...The Pershing-2 missiles are not an offensive weapon but a weapon intended to restrict the rate of escalation of a conflict," and so on and so forth. He could not think up anything more convincing than that. Nor could he refute the fact that these weapons are indeed highly accurate, offensive, first nuclear strike weapons.

Neither could the U.S. representative answer the question of where the air-launched cruise missiles "fitted" into his arithmetical calculations. He could do nothing better than state that this was "classified information concerning the combat load of heavy bombers" and therefore could say nothing in public on this question. But each bomber can carry 20-28 such missiles, and their total number could reach 8,000-10,000! "Classified" and extremely dangerous information--after all, these missiles could add up to 10,000 nuclear warheads to the U.S. strategic arsenal.

In general all the "arithmetic" cited at the briefing causes grave doubts about its authors' conscientiousness. For example, the number of U.S. heavy bombers was sharply reduced--the figure given was 263 instead of 509. For the USSR, however, the number of delivery vehicles of this kind was arbitrarily increased, and by a considerable amount, too--from 150 to 480. The total number of ICBMs and ballistic missiles on submarines and heavy bombers was also very seriously distorted: For the United States it was again reduced from 2,210 to 1,893, whereas for the USSR it was arbitrarily increased--from 2,504 to 2,832. All this has clearly been done with the aim of "proving" the USSR's nonexistent superiority.

As for the results of the reductions proposed under the Soviet scheme, here again the U.S. representative tried to distort the essence of the matter. After all, the USSR agreed that the total number of USSR and U.S. nuclear facilities capable of reaching each other's territory would be 1,250 and 1,680 respectively, that is, it agreed to allow the United States a certain superiority in terms of numbers of delivery vehicles. The USSR is ready to concede that, bearing in mind that the sides will have an equal number of nuclear charges--6,000 each--and approximate strategic equilibrium would thus be ensured. It was just such an equality that the United States used to advocate, it will be remembered. But clearly words are one thing, deeds another. All this does not please some people in Washington very much. That is why they are inventing various pretexts, to distort the essence of the Soviet initiatives and avoid giving a positive, constructive response to the Soviet proposals--a response which the world's peoples demand.

U.S. Deliberately 'Misinterprets' Offer

PM140903 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Oct 85 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "United States Against 'Star Peace'"]

[Text] Washington, 13 Oct (TASS) -- The latest Soviet proposals for a radical reduction of nuclear arms and the nonmilitarization of outer space continue to be widely discussed by politicians, public figures, and the mass media in the United States and Western Europe.

These initiatives have been described as exceptionally important as they open the way to a constructive political dialogue at the forthcoming Soviet-American summit meeting.

This has also been conceded by some senior officials of the U.S. Administration.

But some hardliners in the Washington administration have not given up their deliberate attempts to play down the significance of the new Soviet proposals and misinterpret them.

In the course of current U.S. unofficial contacts with NATO allies to work out a uniform stand on the new Soviet initiatives, for example, an international effort is being made to wash out the meaning of the proposal that a 50 percent cut in the nuclear arms of the two countries, which are capable of reaching the other's territory, is directly linked to the other part of the Soviet proposal that it can be effected only if agreement is reached on the nonmilitarization of outer space, that is, the nondeployment of any kind of weaponry in space.

U.S. spokesmen have deliberately hushed up that part of the proposal and have been eager to reduce it to playing with numbers.

All kinds of "studies" have been launched to prove that the Soviet Union has the edge in offensive weapons systems and so the United States must have a powerful and lasting [moshchnaya i prochnaya] defense in outer space, which is now called Reagan's "Strategic Defense Initiative".

It has been pointed out more than once now that what is being developed has nothing to do with defense but is an offensive system which is geared to arms deployment in outer space and can be used against targets in outer space as well as from space against targets on earth.

This is what the "star wars" concept is all about and no trickery can cover up the fact.

Administration officials have said at the same time that the "Strategic Defense Initiative" is not a bargaining chip. They have been using the words despite the fact that what is at issue is not haggling but taking a sensible decision not to start another dangerous stage of creating space strike weapons, not to set about creating a new class of weaponry that will usher in a new round of the arms race, which will be even more dangerous and have unpredictable implications. What is at issue is not driving a hard bargain but preserving life on earth and preserving civilization.

Paul Nitze, consultant to the U.S. President and the secretary of state on arms reduction talks, and other administration officials are now holding consultations in West European capitals, arguing for the need to push along Reagan's "Strategic Defense Initiative".

Not many West European countries remain cold to the idea since people there take a realistic view of the perilous consequences of the program being implemented.

West German television reported that during Nitze's meeting with Horst Ehmke, vice chairman of the SPD faction in the Bundestag, the U.S. representative was told that the new Soviet proposals should be carefully analyzed and that Mikhail Gorbachev's initiatives need a well-considered reply.

The gambits employed by the U.S. Administration and the military-industrial complex, which has already snatched a huge sum of money in government appropriations to pursue the program, have included a claim that the Soviet Union has had a space program similar to the U.S. program for some time.

It is a lie, and one that has been repeatedly rebutted by the Soviet Union.

As early as the very beginning of the talks in Geneva, the USSR suggested that a moratorium be imposed on the creation, including research and development, and on the testing and deployment of space strike weapons for the entire duration of the negotiations and that the two countries freeze their strategic offensive arms.

The United States has turned down those proposals; it has not given a positive response to them.

But the U.S. Administration has also kept silent on this fact, concealing it from public opinion.

Now another argument has been brought into play, that the 1972 Soviet-American Treaty on the Limitation of Antiballistic Missile Systems allegedly allows research into an antimissile defense, including in space.

This was contended recently, for instance, by Robert McFarlane, assistant to the President for national security affairs.

But this is another lie since Article 5 of that treaty says: "Each party undertakes not to develop, test, or deploy ABM systems or components which are sea-based, air-based, space-based, or mobile land-based."

So, by having started research in space on the Pentagon's assignments effectively with the aim of developing, testing, and launching weapons in space, the United States has been directly violating the ABM treaty.

Gerard Smith, one of the leading authorities on arms control who once served as head of the U.S. delegation to Soviet-American strategic arms limitation talks, told a news conference yesterday that by its actions the U.S. Administration has been dealing a blow to the treaty.

News analysts hold the U.S. Government responsible for these violations. If the United States wants the treaty preserved, it has no right to break either its letter or its individual articles.

The Soviet leaders declare that exploring outer space for peaceful purposes benefits mankind and promotes space science. The United States, however, distorting precisely such an approach by the Soviet Union, asserts that the USSR, like the United States, is carrying out fundamental work into strategic defense. The difference here is perfectly clear. The Soviet fundamental research effort is directed at the peaceful exploration of outer space. The development projects in the United States are carried out under assignments from the Pentagon. Their aim is to develop weapons and to deploy them in space.

Mikhail Gorbachev noted in his replies to TIME magazine: "When we speak about research and the need to ban it, we naturally do not mean basic research. This research is going on and, obviously, will continue."

"What we refer to is the development projects in the United States carried out under assignments and contracts from the Defense Department. Moreover, we have in mind those which have reached a point when models and experimental prototypes are bound to appear and when out-of-laboratory field experiments and tests are to be conducted."

In preparing for Geneva, the U.S. Administration, especially Reagan's entourage, such personalities as Caspar Weinberger, Richard Perle, and Edward Teller, that is, those who set the militarist tone to U.S. policy, declare that the "Strategic Defense Initiative" can in no way be the subject of negotiations in Geneva. That they will not allow discussion of the problem in Geneva.

What about the objective of the negotiations then? In January this year, the U.S. secretary of state and the USSR's foreign minister signed a joint Soviet-American statement on the subject and objectives of the Geneva talks which set forth precisely and clearly that everything will be considered and resolved in interrelationship: space and nuclear armaments -- strategic and medium-range. Does it mean that the United States renounces this agreement? In a word -- no, but in actual fact, a certain group reflecting the interests of the military-industrial complex tirelessly keep saying that strike weapons must be deployed in outer space.

One more argument: By saying that research work is being carried out in the interests of all nations, the United States, under this pretext, is in fact luring its allies into becoming accomplices in the "star wars" program. Why is this being done? This is being done in order to resolve the questions which the Americans are unable to cope with fast enough with the aid of their own scientific potential alone. They want to obtain additional funds from Western Europe, including from private monopolies. They want to get hold of minds, as in the case of the "Manhattan Project", as a result of which the atom bomb was created. At that time, from all over Europe, from all over the world, the United States gathered scientists in order to perform one task -- to create nuclear weapons and thus ensure for itself nuclear supremacy. It created the weapons, but did not ensure supremacy. This should be a lesson to all who gamble on achieving supremacy by means of deploying space weapons.

What is important now is to stop this insane process that may result in disastrous consequences. This is precisely the position to which the Soviet Union adheres. Those who claim that the Soviet Union seeks to hinder U.S. efforts to develop space weapons substantiate their "arguments" by the assertions that this would freeze U.S. technological development and ensure superiority for the Soviet Union in handling its scientific and technical tasks. All this is being said in order to try and place a militarist idea within a framework that has nothing whatsoever to do with the problem.

The Soviet Union is resolving its issues according to its own program; those who entertain the illusion that by creating weapons they may achieve superiority both in the economic and scientific and technical development of the United States will surely be out in their calculations. Time will show this.

No matter what consultations the United States might have with its allies in favor of the "Strategic Defense Initiative", human reason calls for the fulfillment of the mandate of mankind -- outer space must remain peaceful, experiments of all kinds which may bring dangerous consequences upon the world must be stopped.

PRAVDA Commentary 14 October

PM151029 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Oct 85 First Edition p 6

[Dispatch by own correspondent G. Vasilyev: "Washington, October"]

[Text] When you return to Washington from vacation you look at the familiar streets in a new way, you read the newspapers and magazines more attentively than usual, and watch the television programs with heightened interest. You want to understand what has changed in the U.S. capital's political climate—a climate which is so much in flux and which takes shape in a far from spontaneous manner.

I turn on the television. The latest news. NBC is broadcasting a program on the visit to France by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. The two other main television channels—ABC and CBS-- are showing the same thing. They show the eminent guest's departure from Paris and retransmit extracts from the Soviet leader's meeting with French parliamentarians, highlighting his words to the effect that we must "right now, immediately, before it is too late, halt the 'hellbound train' of the arms race, begin to reduce arms, normalize the international situation, and develop peaceful cooperation among the peoples." The latest news ended and a discussion immediately began with the participation of well-known politicians and journalists on the thrust of the radical new Soviet proposals aimed at ensuring a breakthrough in the development of international relations, a breakthrough in favor of peace, security, and international cooperation.

In their commentaries, some celebrities, counting on confusing the issue, are trying to intimidate West Europeans with "the USSR's desire to split NATO" while others are trying to cast doubt on the sincerity and fairness of the new Soviet proposals. But they all admit that the Soviet visit to France was a very important event of international life and has had powerful impact on people's mood throughout the world, which those on the banks of the Potomac cannot fail to consider.

When you look at Washington's political life these October days, you can see that there are many different cares and problems now holding the attention of the U.S. capital--its administration, Congress, the press, and public organizations. But you can easily see that there is one theme which has come to the fore. That is the theme of Soviet-U.S. relations in general and the forthcoming Geneva summit in particular.

The Soviet Union's peace offensive, the local press and political and public figures admit, is having a profound impact on the minds and hearts of people perturbed by the increased danger of a nuclear catastrophe. The Soviet proposals to curb the arms race and the unilateral measures taken by Moscow to achieve this noble goal are demanding increasingly persistently constructive steps from Washington in reply.

"The Soviet Union's peace proposals," an ABC television correspondent comments, "are stepping up the pressure on the U.S. Administration. The West Europeans and many Americans are waiting to see how it will respond to these peace-loving steps." "There is no doubt," the magazine U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT notes, "that, by putting its new arms reduction proposals on the table, the Soviet Union has achieved the political advantage. The Reagan administration is on the defensive." "The Soviet move on the diplomatic chessboard," TIME magazine writes, "backs up their argument that the summit meeting must and can produce specific results."

As we can see the admissions of the successes of the USSR's peace-loving foreign policy are presented here in the form--popular among commentators here--of pointscoreing in some kind of sports competition. But the seriousness of the world situation demands not political games on the world baseball field but specific steps on earth and in space to avert the threat of nuclear war and inspire in people confidence in their future. The USSR has proved and is continuing to prove that it treats this task with a high degree of historical responsibility.

The Soviet Union's introduction of a moratorium on any nuclear explosions has met with a great response in the United States. Another moratorium announced a few months previously by the USSR--on the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe and the taking of retaliatory steps in connection with the deployment of U.S. Pershing 2 and cruise missiles in Europe--was welcomed by sane Americans as a recognition of Moscow's genuine love of peace. The proposals submitted to the United Nations by the Soviet Union "on international cooperation in the peaceful exploration of outer space under the conditions of its nonmilitarization" are now being called the "'star peace' program" here. And finally the package of the Soviet Union's constructive new measures, the first of which is the proposal to the United States that both sides ban strike space armaments completely and reduce in a truly radical manner, by 50 percent, their nuclear armaments which reach each other's territory.

Unfortunately, so far Washington's reaction to these peace-loving actions of the Soviet Union cannot be called constructive. A nuclear explosion in Nevada resounded in response to the Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests. The Americans "saluted" the suspension of the deployment of Soviet medium-range weapons in Europe with a further buildup of their first-strike missiles on the West European countries' territory. And they responded to the Soviet Union's peaceful steps aimed at preventing the militarization of space by testing the ASAT antisatellite system against a target in space. These actions were accompanied in Washington by an outburst of anti-Soviet propaganda, accusations against the Soviet Union involving

every mortal sin, and the stoking of a spy mania campaign. All this could not fail to cause concern among those people in the United States who are hoping for an improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations and are waiting for headway at the Geneva meeting.

There is a room in the White House where not only correspondents but even the majority of the administration apparatus' staffers never go. It is the so-called situation room--a room without windows in the basement of the president's private residence from which, it is said, the White House incumbent must lead the country and the U.S. Armed Forces in the event of an international crisis. Animation has been reigning in the situation room recently. This so-called special group for drafting policy in the arms control field--high-ranking U.S. Administration officials representing the National Security Council, the Pentagon, the State Department, the CIA, and other government subdivisions--gather several times a week in the room. Although the name of this consultative body designed to give recommendations to the president contains the words "arms control," the sentiments prevailing in the White House basement, THE WASHINGTON POST writes, can in no way be described as promoting the attainment of constructive Soviet-U.S. accords.

"It is a group in which skeptics dominate," the newspaper's informed correspondent W. Pincus reports. "People who basically believe that all previous arms control agreements were extremely inconvenient and who share the desire to look 'tough' with respect to the Soviet Union." The correspondent writes that the group's members also include so-called "moderates," those who share doubts about the consequences of the president's "star wars" program and understand the need to seek an accord with the Soviet Union. But they remain in the shadows and the "hawks" play first fiddle right now. Time will show which recommendations will be brought to the president from the situation room, which of them will be accepted and which rejected. Millions of people throughout the world, including Americans, are interested in ensuring that the United States responds in a serious and businesslike manner to the Soviet Union's constructive and realistic measures. This could lead to a fundamental normalization of the explosive international situation.

At present it can be said that official Washington's reaction to the new Soviet proposals is rather contradictory. On the one hand, in contrast to the past, the U.S. Administration leaders have not rejected them out of hand. Thus President Reagan, touching on the Soviet proposals, said that the United States "is prepared for hard but fair talks." Secretary of State G. Shultz has said more or less the same thing: "We hope that they (the new Soviet proposals--G.V.) will lead to a process of genuine negotiations."

But at the same time attempts began immediately at a lower level to discredit the USSR's peace initiative and to prove that the Soviet proposals are "unfair" and "unbalanced." Most often this is stated in talks with the press by anonymous or sometimes open representatives of the administration's middle echelon. Troubadours of the U.S. military-industrial complex like Assistant Defense Secretary R. Perle and K. Adelman, director of the Arms

Control and Disarmament Agency, are particularly zealous in their desire to prevent any progress at the talks on limiting the arms race in space and preventing it in space.

The opponents of detente and peaceful cooperation have not dared to oppose the package of Soviet proposals as a whole and are opening preventive fire on individual clauses. They are particularly perturbed by the question of the future of the so-called U.S. "strategic defense initiative" (SDI). In no circumstances must the Soviet-U.S. talks be allowed to lead to a decision banning the militarization of space--that is the desire gripping the "hawks" here. Thus the authors of a "study" by the extreme rightwing "think tank," the "Heritage Foundation," urge that the United States should move as rapidly as possible from research and experimental work to the deployment of space armaments.

But however loudly the "hawks'" speeches may resound, they cannot conceal the fact that grave misgivings over the present U.S. course also exist on the Capitol Hill. One piece of evidence of this was the report from a division of the U.S. Congress Office of Technology Assessment whose authors, expressing the viewpoint of both Democrats and Republicans, assess the SDI very critically. The U.S. plans for the militarization of space were sharply criticized in a recent publication of the influential public organization the association of arms control supporters. They "are not only an obstacle on the path of progress in Geneva," this publication says, "they also threaten to destroy the entire structure of arms control created in the past 2 decades." Despite the desperate resistance of the military-industrial complex reluctant to concede a single missile or submarine, there is a maturing understanding here of the fact that if mankind wants to survive, it must break the vicious circle of the arms race and mutual suspicion.

...The violent Hurricane Gloria recently swept over the eastern regions of the United States. Descending from the skies in a curtain of rain, it seemed to close the lingering summer. Fall arrived definitively and irreversibly on the banks of the Potomac--a time when the air flows colder and the temperature of political life rises.

October is elapsing here under the sign of the Soviet Union's peace offensive. M.S. Gorbachev's speeches during his visit to France and the bold and at the same time realistic Soviet proposals aimed at normalizing the explosive international situation are exerting profound influence on the U.S. public. Sane Americans welcome the Soviet initiatives. For many days now Washington's official offices have been considering how to respond to them. The interests of mankind, including the U.S. people themselves, demand that it be a response dictated by reason and realism. So that the most terrible hurricane--the tornado of nuclear war--can never descend on out earth.

Carrington Remarks Criticized

LD221424 Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 22 Oct 85

[Text] NATO's Secretary-General, Lord Carrington, has joined the campaign of American Administration officials who are trying to minimize the importance of the new peace initiatives put forward in Paris by the Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev.

Speaking in London, Lord Carrington groundlessly claimed that the effectuation [as heard] of the Soviet proposals to the United States Government on banning the development of strike space weapons and reducing by 50 percent the nuclear armaments capable of reaching each other's territory would put America's NATO allies in jeopardy. It's noteworthy that NATO's chief kept silent about the proposals directly concerning Europe which have been advanced by the USSR and other socialist countries. These provide for signing a nonaggression pact between NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization, and for totally freeing the continent from nuclear and chemical weapons.

CSO: 5200/1057

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SOVIET ARMY PAPER EDITORIAL ON GORBACHEV PARIS VISIT

PMI41537 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 12 Oct 85 Second Edition p 1

[Editorial: "A Good-will Mission"]

[Text] "Any rapprochement, with France is highly desirable," V.I. Lenin said back during the first years of Soviet power. These words of his, and the idea which they express, have lost none of their significance today because cooperation between the USSR and France accords with the vital interests of both peoples. This was confirmed once again by the visit to France of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Assessing the results of this visit, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo emphasized at a regular session that M.S. Gorbachev's talks with President F. Mitterrand of France and other French politicians and public figures, and the accords achieved during the talks, provide a good basis for the further development of relations between the Soviet Union and France. The talks in Paris were meaningful and were marked by a constructive spirit. As was noted at the joint press conference in Paris, the results of the discussion of Soviet-French relations offer the prospect of a more active political dialogue and enhanced economic and trade cooperation between the two countries. "On the whole," M.S. Gorbachev said at the press conference, "the results of the talks are not just positive in our view, I would go as far as to describe them as impressive.

They serve the interests of the Soviet and the French peoples and the broader interests of European and international security."

F. Mitterrand also rated the results of the visit as very positive. M.S. Gorbachev's visit, he declared, "enabled both sides to gain a better understanding of each other." French Minister of External Relations R. Dumas in turn noted that the Soviet-French talks were "successful in every respect."

This alone provides every reason to describe the visit to France as a good-will mission. However, its significance extends far beyond the framework of purely bilateral relations. The Soviet-French summit is of great importance for the strengthening of European security, the expansion of all-European cooperation, and the improvement of the international situation. The major proposals put forward by the Soviet Union with a view to preventing the militarization of space, curbing the race in nuclear and other arms, and promoting fruitful international cooperation in Europe and the world as a whole are convincing evidence of the Soviet state's peace-loving foreign policy course.

It is symbolic that the program for normalizing the explosive international situation which is threatening the cause of peace -- the USSR's constructive and far-reaching new proposals which are aimed at curbing the pernicious arms race -- was unveiled by the Soviet leader in Paris, the very heart of Europe. This is because here, in Europe, the interrelated nature of the peoples' destinies, irrespective of the different sociohistorical paths which they have chosen, is felt particularly strongly.

The whole world has been able to see for itself that the Soviet Union is not just urging peace but is doing all in its power to halt the armsrace, initiate arms reductions, improve the international situation, and develop cooperation between peoples with the aim of ensuring a peaceful future of the planet Earth. Both, the official visit to France and preparations for the Soviet-American summit in Geneva, are evidence of the high degree of responsibility displayed by the Soviet Union in the international arena in respect of future generations and the fate of human civilization.

The USSR's new initiatives met with the approval of the broad public and of the political circles and leadership of many states. They are interpreted as a step which offers the possibility of a breakthrough in strengthening the security of all countries and peoples.

The Soviet proposals aimed at improving the political climate are at the focus of discussions among U.S. politicians and public figures. Those among them who assess the situation soberly cannot overlook that these proposals open up broad prospect for political dialogue at the upcoming Geneva summit. However, other tendencies are also in evidence. Representatives of the military-industrial complex and those who reflect its sentiments in the Washington administration are trying to undermine the significance of the Soviet initiatives and even to distort their essence in order to discredit the Soviet Union's proposals on nuclear and space weapons. These attempts are futile. Prominent statesmen and public figures and the news media in many countries, paying tribute to the Soviet program for normalizing the explosive international situation, emphasize in their reactions and commentaries that in return for its peace-loving steps the USSR is entitled to expect that the West, too, will contribute its share as regards detente and will put forward equivalent proposals aimed at strengthening international security, peace, and cooperation. The Soviet leader stated weightily and firmly for all the world to hear.

"We are strong enough to give a crushing rebuff to any attempt to encroach on our people's security and peaceful labor. But we believe that the correctness of the ideology and the superiority of the system which each nation has chosen in accordance with its will has to be proven solely and exclusively by force of example and not by force of arms. This is our unshakable conviction."

This is the conviction of all Soviet people. Ardently approving the results of M.S. Gorbachev's visit to France and the USSR's new peace initiatives which he set forth, our country's working people are declaring their unbending determination to struggle even more actively for the implementation of the party's designs, for the acceleration of our country's socioeconomic development, and for the strengthening of peace and peoples' security.

Together with all Soviet people, the USSR Armed Forces servicemen who are vigilantly guarding the motherland's security are expressing their full approval of and firm support for the USSR's Leninist foreign policy, the results of M.S. Gorbachev's visit to France, and the program which he put forward for the normalization of the explosive international situation. They are trying successfully to complete the training year and to greet the upcoming 27th CPSU Congress with new successes in combat and political training and with new accomplishments for the benefit of our great fatherland.

CSO: 5200/1059

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SOVIET POLITBURO DISCUSSES GORBACHEV PARIS VISIT

LD101930 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 10 Oct 85

[Excerpts] At its routine meeting, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo confirmed the CPSU Central Committee slogans for the 68th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. The text of the slogans will be published in the press.

The Politburo examined the results of the visit to France by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. It was stressed that his conversations with the president of France, Francois Mitterrand, and other political and public figures of that country and the accords achieved during the talks have laid a good foundation for the further development of friendly relations between the Soviet Union and France. The significance was noted of the Soviet-French summit meeting for the strengthening of European security, broadening general European cooperation, and improving the international situation.

The major proposals put forward by the Soviet Union directed toward preventing the militarization of outer space, curbing the nuclear and other arms race and the development of fruitful international cooperation in Europe and in the world as a whole, convincingly demonstrate the peaceful foreign-policy course of our state.

It was noted with satisfaction that the new initiatives of the Soviet Union have been met with approval by the broad public, political circles, and leadership of many states. They are being assessed as an action which opens up the possibility of a change toward a radical improvement in international relations and strengthening the security of all countries and peoples.

CSO: 5200/1059

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR: REPORTS, COMMENTS ON THIRD ROUND PROCEEDINGS

Strategic Arms Group 2 October

LD021421 Moscow TASS in English 1400 GMT 2 Oct 85

[Text] Geneva, 2 Oct (TASS)--A meeting of the group for strategic armaments has been held here today within the framework of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons.

Medium-Range Arms Group 4 October

LD041857 Moscow TASS in English 1314 GMT 4 Oct 85

[Text] Geneva, 4 Oct (TASS)--The group on medium-range nuclear arms held a session here today within the framework of Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons.

Space Arms Group 8 October

LD081213 Moscow TASS in English 1158 GMT 8 Oct 85

[Text] Geneva, 8 Oct (TASS)--A meeting of the group for outer space weapons has been held here within the framework of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and outer space weapons.

Strategic Arms Group 9 October

LD091224 Moscow TASS in English 1216 GMT 9 Oct 85

[Text] Geneva, 9 Oct (TASS)--The group on strategic armaments held its session here today within the framework of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space armaments.

PM101351 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Oct 85 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Inappropriate Statements"]

[Text] Geneva, 9 Oct -- An official bulletin issued by the U.S. mission at the UN office in Geneva contains excerpts from a private conversation between M. Kampelman, head of the U.S. delegation at the Geneva talks, and a group of U.S. businessmen.

While claiming that the "U.S. Government will do everything possible" to advance the cause of arms control, M. Kampelman bluntly stated that the U.S. side will be "stubborn" and will "not accept an agreement" until the terms set out by the United States have been met.

As THE NEW YORK TIMES notes in this connection, the tone of M. Kampelman's statements was "sharper than it usually is on arrival in Geneva or before the start of negotiations with the Russians." It points out the "exceptional nature of the actual publication" of private statements by the leader of the U.S. delegation in Geneva as an official document of the U.S. mission in Geneva, stressing that "both sides participating in the talks have agreed to refrain from commenting in public on the substance of questions which have a bearing on the talks." "Official U.S. spokesmen have not given any explanation" why this was done, the paper writes. Observers point out that this step can only be seen as a new attempt by hard-liners in the administration to poison the atmosphere on the eve of the Soviet-American summit.

Karpov Sees 'No Concrete Results'

AU232118 Paris AFP in English 2112 GMT 23 Oct 85

[Text] Geneva, Oct 23 (AFP) -- No concrete results have emerged from the third round of Soviet-U.S. talks here on curtailing nuclear and space weapons, Soviet delegation chief Viktor Karpov said here today.

Speaking to journalists at the end of a working session with his U.S. counterpart Max Kampelman today, Mr. Karpov said "We are back to where we started last March" when the first round was held. He added that the "Americans have yet to reply to the proposals we put to them" on September 30.

"We don't expect them to respond before the summit meeting between Reagan and Gorbachev," he said, in a reference to the superpower summit between President Ronald Reagan and Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev in Geneva on November 19-20.

Soviet sources said today's session between the Soviet and U.S. delegations was designed to review the results of this third round and decide when it should end.

The third round opened September 19 and should normally last two months. But it may well end earlier because of the Reagan-Gorbachev summit, the Soviet 1917 Revolution celebrations on November 7 and Soviet desire to cut it short, observers said.

The two previous rounds of the talks focusing on strategic and medium-range nuclear arms as well as space weapons were held from March 12 to April 23 and from May 30 to July 16 this year.

CSO: 5200/1057

SOVIET GENERAL MIKHAYLOV ON SDI, SS-20'S, CHEMICAL ARMS

AU211426 Vienna DIE PRESS in German 21 Oct 85 p 1

[Peter Martos report on interview with General Konstantin Mikhaylov, member of the General Staff of the Soviet Armed Forces -- date and place of interview not given]

[Text] Vienna -- In the interest of disarmament, the Soviet Union is ready to change its previous position in the negotiations with the United States. In a talk with DIE PRESSE, a member of the Red Army General Staff not only hinted at the price Moscow would be ready to pay for U.S. renunciation of space armament plans, but in General Mikhaylov's opinion, even far-reaching verification of future treaties could be possible. At the same time, he revealed details about armament plans Moscow wants to implement if President Reagan's SDI project is continued.

General Constantin Mikhaylov, deputy head of the administration for legal and administrative affairs of the General Staff, [rank, name, and title as published] has obviously been "politically" prepared for the interview, which was arranged through the APN Soviet news agency. As a participant in the disarmament conference of the Socialist International [held in Vienna on 16 and 17 October] ("I was particularly attentive because this was the first time that I have attended such a meeting in the West"), he naturally has to represent the Kremlin's propagandistic position. The discussion indeed goes back again and again to long-known Soviet lines of argument. Nevertheless, there are some rather striking statements.

The most important of these in view of the forthcoming Geneva summit meeting between General Secretary Gorbachev and U.S. President Reagan concerns the problem of verification of future treaties. Mikhaylov: "Regarding chemical weapons, too, additional measures are envisaged besides national control methods." The general mentions on-site inspections as well as constantly manned observation posts in "enemy territory," which, he says, "could function in the same way in other sectors." The Soviet Union is just as much interested in verification as the United States -- only, disarmament should not be determined by verification; it must be the other way round, otherwise the "cart would be put before the horse."

A cautiously worded verification offer to the United States is being wrapped up in a plea for the USSR's will to peace: The SS-20 intermediate-range missiles that have now been pulled out of Europe in the past few months "can now also be verified: They are no longer in active combat positions, not even in the eastern Soviet Union." In this context Mikhaylov gave the number of SS-20 missiles trained on Europe as 243 units. At the same time, he announced that the carrier systems of the withdrawn missiles -- self-propelled mounts and semitrailer trucks -- "will be dismantled in October and November."

The General Staff seems to have rather concrete ideas about the next steps if the United States does not abandon its Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). According to Mikhaylov, the USSR would not imitate [Western] technology but would "utilize existing technology of its own." This would mean: 1) expansion and further development of offensive missile systems that "could overcome" SDI; 2) Production of antisatellite weapons; and 3) Soviet "special projects" on which no details were given. Naturally, the general uses the opportunity for tying in propaganda: With the U.S. project and the Soviet reaction to it "all past agreements would be destroyed: In principle no arms reduction would be possible any longer."

On the whole, Mikhaylov regards space-based defense systems as "hardly possible in the near future."

To the question of whether the Soviet Union has pursued projects similar to SDI, he gives an evasive answer at first: "No, at present nothing is being tested that would violate ABM Treaty (on the limitation of antiballistic missile systems)." The moratorium that was unilaterally proclaimed in 1983 is still valid to his day, even though the tests at that time were not completed, he says. But: "Of course, scientific research is continuing to develop." A second question following up the first, as to whether experiments with new technologies had been made earlier, was answered evasively: There have been scientific tests with lasers, "but not for military purposes."

The last question to the Soviet general concerns the fate of the dismissed chief of the General Staff Nikolay Ogarkov. Mikhaylov depicts its as something "quite normal" for an officer to be suddenly transferred to another assignment. Asked where Ogarkov is assigned now, the general laughs: "He is working and healthy."

CSO: 5200/1057

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

USSR PAPER ON U.S. 'DISINFORMATION' ON CW

PM081329 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 6 Oct 85 Second Edition p 3

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Press Service report: "An Unconstructive Approach"]

[Text] The problems of chemical weapons have recently been taking an increasingly notable place in the pages of the American press and the speeches of U.S. politicians. The attention of the press is focused on the statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the effect that in the event of the creation of a zone free from chemical weapons in Central Europe, the USSR would be prepared to guarantee and respect the status of that zone. The Boston GLOBE newspaper published an article giving a detailed account of this statement. Some American observers have acknowledged its topicality and importance.

At the same time this stance on the USSR's part has caused undisguised irritation to official Washington. And that is no accident. After all, as CBS television noted, it "strikes at the very core of the Reagan administration's arguments in favor of the production of chemical arms." And in the near future a vote is expected to take place in Congress on the allocation of funds for chemical weapons production.

With a view to the disinformation of the American public and to exerting pressure on the legislators, the U.S. administration has launched a propaganda campaign on the question of chemical weapons. The leaders of the foreign policy department and important Pentagon staffers try to prove in numerous interviews that the USSR's statement is no more than "propaganda." The WALL STREET JOURNAL formulated the essence of Washington's unconstructive approach thus: "Without any justification, the Reagan administration rejected the proposal concerning a zone free from chemical weapons in Central Europe." At the same time Washington inspired a number of articles in the NEW YORK TIMES and other newspapers containing slanderous fabrications, not supported by evidence, about some kind of "chemical threat from the USSR." All this indicates that the administration is trying by any means possible to continue its "chemical rearming" program. This is also indicated by the fact that, without waiting for the vote in Congress, they have started issuing orders for the production of binary munitions.

CSO: 5200/1065

PRAVDA CITES PRC PAPER ON U.S. CHEMICAL WARFARE PLANS

PM100822 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Oct 85 First Edition p 5

["Own Information" report under the rubric "Press Testimony": "'It Is Better To Disarm'"]

[Text] A few days ago the Chinese newspaper RENMIN RIBAO published under this headline ["It Is Better To Disarm"] a signed commentary in connection with the Washington administration's decision to resume production of chemical weapons.

The article points out that the United States is planning to deploy stockpiles of new chemical munitions in West Europe. This news has generated a wave of indignation and sharp protests in West European states. The public is demanding a ban on this type of mass destruction weapon.

Mountains of arms are already stockpiled in Europe, RENMIN RIBAO notes--guns, tanks, aircraft, and missiles with nuclear warheads. And now, on the pretext of "guaranteeing European security," the United States wants to deploy chemical munitions there. But since concern for peace on the continent insistently suggests disarmament instead of "arms upgrading," the newspaper concludes.

CSO: 5200/1066

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

IZVESTIYA ON BRITAIN AS PENTAGON'S 'HOSTAGE'

LD112353 Moscow TASS in English 1857 GMT 11 Oct 85

["IZVESTIYA: Britain and the Binary Weapon" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, October 11 TASS -- The British Isles, where the Pentagon operates as it sees fit, have been assigned the destiny of the Pentagon's double hostage: first a nuclear hostage and now a chemical weapons hostage, Aleksandr Krivopalov, IZVESTIYA'S correspondent in London, writes today. Britain is among the first of the NATO countries, where the United States military are in a hurry to deploy secretly the binary weapon. On this issue, as on a number of others, official London completely obeys the orders coming from the overseas, acting as the best pupil in the Atlantic class, but disregarding the national interests of its people.

The truth that the tory government is accepting behind the backs of Britons Washington's new aggressive plan to include the binary weapon into the strategic arsenal of the USA for carrying out offensive operations and using it already in the first strike is being carefully concealed from the people, the correspondent continues. And yet tit-bits of alarming information about the surrender to the high-handed militarists on the opposite side of the Atlantic leaked into the British press.

The unforeseen publicity on the question of secret talks concerning the American binary weapon has emerged in Parliament.

Yet in disregard of the sentiments of the British citizens, the Conservative Cabinet is doing its utmost to evade a public discussion of that problem. And yet on the basis of some evidence, which appeared in British newspapers, Aleksandr Krivopalov writes in conclusion, it can be assumed that it has made a number of dangerous steps to please the American strategists. At the very moment when the debate on the binary weapon on the Capitol Hill in Washington has entered its final stage, the tories have again reaffirmed their loyalty to Washington.

CSO: 5200/1065

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

SOVIET SCIENTIST ON GENETIC CONSEQUENCES OF CHEMICAL WARFARE

LD062339 Moscow TASS in English 1914 GMT 6 Oct 85

[Text] Leningrad, 6 Oct (TASS)--The consequences of the use of chemical weapons in war would make themselves felt on several generations, maintains Professor Nikolay Vasilevskiy, head of the Department of Ecological Physiology at the Leningrad Research Institute of Experimental Medicine. His assessment is based on the study of the effect of defoliants, sprayed by the United States in Vietnam, on newborn babies and experiments on animals.

When penetrating the body, the toxins continue their baneful effect in the generations to come, causing irreversible changes at the genetic level, the scientist pointed out.

"Thinking about the use of chemical weapons means deliberately advancing the aim of destroying civilization," Vasilevskiy stressed in a talk with a TASS correspondent. "Large numbers of people, chiefly civilians, would be poisoned."

According to estimates by Soviet and foreign specialists, the presumed ratio of victims from among servicemen and civilians would be one to twenty.

It is necessary to adopt urgent cardinal measures to prevent the chemical threat, the scientist stressed. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries made concrete proposals in this direction. Regrettably, the United States and its NATO partners do not need the voice of reason. [A total of] 124.5 million dollars are set aside in the United States in 1986 for the programme of building up chemical weapons.

"Medical scientists cannot remain indifferent under these circumstances: our profession urges us to oppose these inhuman plans," Vasilevskiy said. "We believe that disaster can be prevented, and we, on our part, will do everything possible to achieve this goal."

CSO: 5200/1065

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

BRIEFS

TASS: LUXEMBOURG URGES BAN--Luxembourg, 16 Oct (TASS)--A joint statement published here today by Jacques Poos, deputy prime minister and minister of foreign affairs of Luxembourg, and Marc Fischbach, minister of Armed Forces, says that the Government of Luxembourg stands for a total ban and elimination of chemical weapons. The best method to solve the chemical weapons problem is a radical one. Chemical weapons should be eliminated everywhere in the world, the statement says. It points out that the Government of Luxembourg supports the signing of an international agreement on the total ban on the production, storage and also the use of chemical arms under active international control. The ministers made the statement in response to an inquiry by a Democratic MP. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 0107 GMT 17 Oct 85]

CSO: 5200/1065

GENERAL

BELGIUM'S TINDEMANS DISCUSSES NATO MEETING

DW161125 Hamburg ARD Television Network in German 2130 GMT 15 Oct 85

[Interview with Belgian Foreign Minister Leo Tindemans by correspondent Manfred Bainczyk in Brussels on 15 October; from the "Tagesthemen" program--recorded]

[Text] [Bainczyk] Was it just the form used by the Americans that irritated you or did concrete political points anger you?

[Tindemans] I would say both. We are members of an alliance. The meeting between Gorbachev and Reagan is extremely important. Various countries in Europe have deployed or probably will deploy missiles, like the Netherlands. I believe that in this particular case it was absolutely necessary for us to see and consult each other before the U.S. President meets the CPSU general secretary.

[Bainczyk] Did Secretary of State Shultz divulge today any details concerning the U.S. strategy for the preparation of the Geneva summit meeting, and if so, which?

[Tindemans] He gave a very good explanation of the U.S. position. The envisaged agenda is not limited to weapons, it is much broader. They would like to talk about other problems as well, because they see this meeting in the context of East-West relations. This comprises more than just talking about weapons.

[Bainczyk] An important problem is the question whether an antimissile system in space is compatible with the ABM treaty, that is to say, with the limitation of an antimissile system. Did the Americans provide interpretations on this subject today?

[Tindemans] They are quite orthodox. They do not wish to go any further than the best lawyers say they should.

[Bainczyk] What does this mean?

[Tindemans] This means that one abides by this limitation, because this is what the ABM treaty stands for, a limitation. One should not go any further without negotiating anew with the Soviet Union, and before such negotiating is done this should be discussed in the alliance as well. And this came out quite clearly. There is no misunderstanding anymore: The United States will not try to give as broad an interpretation as possible; the United States will stay quite orthodox and strict, just as it is acceptable everywhere.

[Bainczyk] This means research, but no tests and deployment?

[Tindemans] It means that the interpretation will be based on what is written in the treaty. Nothing will be added, nor will they say: Look, the Russians are already doing it, hence we are allowed to do likewise. No, one abides by the treaty.

[Bainczyk] The Soviet disarmament proposals are assessed differently by the NATO partners. Have you found positive elements in them?

[Tindemans] Yes. I believe these proposals are positive. What we do not like so much is the fact that the proposals in general are applicable bilaterally and therefore are a bit anti-European. We are afraid that Europe and our interests are being ignored. Still, this provides a very good opportunity to present counterproposals.

CSO: 5200/2527

END

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

25 NOV 1985